THE MADRAS CHRISTIAN COLLEGE MAGAZINE.

DECEMBER, 1885.

CHRIST THE EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

To those who are familiar with the current literature of the day, it is no secret that it is being whispered that Christianity is about played out and must soon make way for some more rational theory of life. Materialists like the late Professor Clifford, who wrote for his epitaph these mournful words, "I was not, was conceived, I loved and did a little work, I am not and grieve not," tell us that all our boasted spiritual, intellectual life is but a function of organised matter, and necessarily comes to an end when death destroys the organisms of the body, that God if there be a God, is but 'the sum of the matter and force of the universe,' and that Christianity in its most essential elements is the product of ignorance and superstition. Agnostics, like Herbert Spencer, who take as their motto 'know nothing,' tell us that whether there be a God and a future world as Christianity asserts, men can never know, and secularists who carry into practice the speculative theory of Agnosticism tell us that instead of wasting their time and thought on what may after all turn out to be not great realities as Christians believe, but the mere dreams of disordered brains, men should confine their attention solely to this nether world, get as much out of it as they can, ere they pass into the silence and darkness of death. Positivists like Frederick Harrison and Miss Bevington, desirous of getting rid of God,

and Christ, and the future world, and yet retaining some aim in life worthy of exciting moral enthusiasm, tell us that Christianity with its doctrine of the necessity and importance of personal salvation must give place to a higher system in which the object of worship will be Humanity or the whole race past, present and future of mankind, the supreme duty will be to live for the good of Humanity, and the only possible immortality will be to live on in lives that have been made better by our presence.

But apart from those who give in their adherence to one or other of these theories of life—Materialism, Agnosticism, Secularism or Positivism, there is, perhaps, a much larger class who have no sympathy with such low views of life as are advocated by Materialists and Secularists, who are yet haunted with a suspicion that the evidence for Christianity is not so clear as the majority of Christians believe. The miracles recorded in the Old and New Testaments which have been looked upon as one of the chief evidences of Christianity, they regard as one of the chief stumbling blocks in the way of belief. They hear so much about the uniformity of law and the impossibility of a break in nature, and the history of other religions has made them so familiar with the gradual growth of wonderful stories regarding their founders, and with the extraordinary credulity of even honest witnesses in an unscientific age, that however much good they may see in Christianity, they feel that the whole system is resting upon an insecure foundation. The inspiration and authority of scripture, which others have regarded as sufficient guarantee for much that was mysterious and apparently contrary to reason in Christianity, has with them no weight. There is so much they imagine that is questionable in the morality of the Old Testament, and so much even in the New Testament to which exception can be taken, and above all there is so much uncertainty about the origin of both the Old Testament and the New that the absolute authoritativeness of scripture is even more difficult to defend than the mysterious truths of revelation for whose defence it is invoked.

It is with a desire to help such persons to firmer standing ground that I write these pages.—Christianity professes to be a revelation—but a revelation of what? Sometimes it is said that Christianity is a revelation of truths undiscoverable by reason regarding God and the future world, man's fallen condition and the reconciliation of God's justice and mercy in his salvation. There can be no doubt that Christianity does teach us new and glorious truths regarding

both God and man, and that correct views about both are of the utmost importance in the development of spiritual character, yet it may be questioned whether Christianity is *essentially* a revelation of doctrine. There are so many men of correct views living low-toned selfish lives, so many defenders of doctrine, orthodox and heterodox, who are little imbued with the spirit of Christ, that it is not out of place to ask whether, if Christianity had been merely a revelation of new doctrine, it could have secured the moral and spiritual triumphs of which it can so justly boast. There is so little spiritual power in mere abstract doctrine to change and ennoble men's hearts that we are forced to believe there is something more in Christianity than that. Doctrine without personal power behind it is but words, and mere words will never regenerate or ennoble human life, as Christianity we know has succeeded in doing.

Again it is sometimes said that Christianity is a revelation of moral duty, and that its triumphs are due to the inculcation of a higher morality than had been set forth either amongst Jews or Greeks. There can be no doubt that Christianity does teach a higher morality than any other religion or moral system, that the inculcation of a higher morality is essential in the formation of the highest life, yet Christianity is not chiefly a revelation of moral duty. So many moralists have eloquently expounded the scope of moral duty and yet failed to have any appreciable effect upon the moral life of their time, and so many men know the good and do the ill that were Christianity no more than the revelation of a superior kind of morality its moral triumphs would be an insoluble puzzle. Moral precept without moral life behind it, no more than religious doctrine without religious life behind it, can be the regenerator of Society that Christianity has been. Of what then is Christianity the revelation? It must be the revelation of what has power to change men's hearts, ennoble and purify their lives and inspire them with moral enthusiasm and spiritual fervour. What this is we can determine from our own experience. It is the personal power of a moral, spiritual life. When the world is twining its fatal stems round the growing plant of our spiritual life, what is it that awakens us to a sense of the reality of that higher world that is eternal and invisible, but the presence of some friend whose life is fragrant with the odours of a higher sphere? When our will is weak, and trembles under the fascinating power of the lust of the eye and the pride of life, what is it that gives us strength to trample temptation under our feet

but that strange mysterious power which flows out like a magnetic current from the pure soul of our brother and enters into ours? When we are flagging in the Christian race, what is it that revives our zeal and spurs us on to run with patience, but the enthusiasm of a fellow runner who sweeps us along with himself? And when our love to God and man is burning dull and low, what is it that transforms it into a glowing flame, but the spiritual heat of the life of one who is himself aglow with the love of Christ?

This personal influence is the mightiest power in the moral and spiritual world; nay it is the only power, for the words of doctrine or moral precept can have weight only when there is a man behind them. What tells upon men is life—the mysterious subtle power of a living spirit. Whatever convinces men of their evil, brings them nearer God, purifies their hearts and ennobles their lives is an influence that in the last resort emanates somehow from a pure and noble life, for only life can minister to life, only a living spirit can touch and move another spirit.

If then personal influence is the mightiest power in the spiritual world, it is natural to expect that Christianity will be the revelation of such a power. And such indeed it is. It is a revelation not so much of doctrine or of duty as above all of the power of a divinely human life. It is not so much a book revelation as a personal revelation. The Bible is but the record of revelation, the revelation itself is the life of Christ—Christ in his power to reconcile men to God, and to lift them to the height of his own spiritual level.

There is drawn for us in the pages of the New Testament a character so far transcending that of any other person of whom history speaks, that men who are unwilling to admit that there has been such a break in the continuity of the moral history of humanity as the New Testament story implies are forced to explain away the apparent anomaly of a character so extraordinary by denying the reliability of the New Testament narrative. While fully allowing that there did live in Palestine a remarkable person Jesus of Nazareth, they attribute the creation of his character as there presented to the pious fancy of the first three or four generations of Christians, amongst whom the true facts of the life of Jesus were exaggerated and idealised by the unconscious tendency of disciples to throw a halo round the memory of their master.

There is no question even amongst unbelievers that the character of Jesus as drawn in the Gospels—whether the narratives are

reliable or not—is unique in the annals of the human race. From a pure, holy childhood he grows into the flower of perfect manhood making men conscious in his presence of a wonderful goodness they can better wonder at than understand. There is such a heavenly richness and beauty in his whole bearing that all the highest moral precepts are but poor attempts to set forth the inexhaustible fulness and grace of this living example,—while other religious teachers tell us about God, Jesus brings God himself near us, shows us God in human word and action. In that great word, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," we hear the voice of the Almighty Everlasting Father, in the mercy with which he stoops to the trembling outcast, we see the condescension of the Judge of all the earth, in the agony of Gethsemane and the darkness of Calvary, we see the self-sacrifing love of a Father who can sympathise with and suffer for us.

We may distrust the narrative, but there can be no question that in the narrative Jesus claims to come from the bosom of the Father, to be one with Him in heart and life, and to reveal to men the holiness and forgiving love of the Father in his own words and action. While making himself the servant of all, living the lowliest, most self-denying of lives, he yet dares to say to the whole world "Believe in me," "Follow me." Mixing freely amongst men, and feasting with publicans and sinners, he can yet ask "which of you convinceth me of sin" and apart from his own words we feel, as we read the story of his life, that he moves in a higher sphere than all else, that he is somehow from above, that, as Horace Bushnell expresses it, "the incense of the upper world is brought out in his garments and flows abroad as a perfume on the poisoned air." The slow blundering way in which his disciples with all their honesty and simplicity of heart came to understand the true character and purpose of their Master, shows how far he was removed above their plane, and the awe which his presence inspired even in those by whom he was hated is an eloquent testimony to the wonderfulness of his charcter, and a still more eloquent testimony is to be found in the lives which his presence is said to have ennobled and purified.

It is open to men like the German Strauss to allege that, however unique, however supernatural the character of Christ may be as portrayed in the Gospel narrative, we are yet without evidence that Jesus of Nazareth actually lived a sinless life, actually claimed to be one with the Father, or actually performed the miracles recorded in the New Testament. Strauss, unable to deny that the Gospels

portray a character that, were it real, would be something absolutely new in human history, something in fact supernatural, spent many years of his life in the attempt to prove that the Gospels were not written till the second century, long after the events they record, and that the stories about Jesus that imply he was different from ordinary men are myths, created by the idealising fancies of those who looked to him as their master.

To this mythical theory of the origin of the narratives of the life of Christ it has been replied by competent scholars that at whatever period our Gospels were written, the generation of Christians, who lived immediately after Christ's death, believed in those very elements of Christianity which Strauss attempts to make a subsequent and gradual development. In Epistles of Paul written, as no one denies, within about 30 years of the Crucifixion the sinlessness of Jesus, his oneness with the Father, his power to work miracles are quietly taken for granted, as if they were so well known that no one would possibly dispute them. Again it has been replied to Strauss that the character of Christ as drawn in the Gospels is so wonderful so unlike what men had been accustomed to, or hoped for, that it is impossible to explain it, unless it was taken from life. To draw such a character, without a Christ to draw it from, would have needed a Christ to draw it.

But another answer, I conceive, can be given to all such theories as that of Strauss—an answer which can be little affected by discussions regarding the date of the gospels or the canonicity of the other books of the New Testament.

How, let us ask, do we come to know what a man really is? Not by a catalogue of his virtues or vices but by seeing how he influences his fellows. When Shakspeare draws the character of Lady Macbeth, he does not give us a long description of the elements of her character, he lets us see how she acts upon her husband, the murderers and the other persons in the play, and from the influence she exerts upon others we can form a much truer estimate of what she is, than by any laboured analysis of her character. Indeed the art of the dramatist or novelist consists first in managing situations in which the influence the hero exerts on others will reveal his inward character to the reader; for such a situation well chosen, well managed, is worth pages of mere description. So in real life, we come to know a man's character by watching his influence upon ourselves and others, for what is within must come out in that subtle power that one exercises over another. In judging

a man we look to the number of men he has inspired with his own enthusiasm, the higher life he has stimulated others to live through the power of his personal influence. In estimating the character of an individual in our midst what we trust to is not the catalogue of virtues admiring friends supply us with, but the power he possesses to present us with an example of spiritual beauty, and to strengthen us for a life of true faithful service to God.

When Strauss attempts, and attempts in vain, to get rid of the wonderfulness of Christ's character by discrediting the Gospel narratives, we can reply that the New Testament is not the only witness to it, that we have another witness by which we can test that of the New Testament. We can judge of Christ as we judge of others by the influence they have exercised on the men of their own succeeding generations—by the impress they have left upon humanity.

We know that the immediate disciples of Jesus were at first, narrow-minded, religiously selfish, and uncultured Jews, but were so changed under the spell of their Master's personal influence, that, carried along in the current of an enthusiastic devotion to Him who died for them, they passed the narrow bounds of Judaism and spent their lives in preaching the person of their Lord to Jew and Gentile, some of them presenting a rare example of the depth and beauty of spiritual life, and exercising a marvellous influence in the regeneration of human society. If it is objected, as it cannot justly be objected, that for the extraordinary change that took place in the character of the disciples of Jesus, the New Testament is our only witness, no sane man can deny the extraordinary change that took place in the life of Jew and Gentile, in the generations that followed, through the preaching of Christ and Him crucified. From the bosom of barren, proud and dead Judaism, there came thousands of humble, self-denying, enthusiastic Christians, who rejoiced in the universal brotherhood of believers, and were willing to die that Gentiles might be brought under the power of Jesus; and from the luxurious, licentious, and godless society of Greek and Roman towns there came many converts, whose regenerated life bore witness to the power there was in the name of Jesus to cleanse the impure, and ennoble the degraded life and soul. "The Fathers," says McLecky in his *History of European morals,* "urged with a just and noble pride that whatever doubt there might be of the truth of the Christian doctrines, or of the divine origin of the Christian miracles, there was at least no doubt that Christianity transformed the characters of multitudes, vivified the cold heart by a new enthusiasm, redeemed,

regenerated and emancipated the most depraved of mankind. Noble lives crowned by heroic deaths were the best arguments of the infant church. Their enemies themselves not unfrequently acknowledged it."

And what shall we say of the power that the name of Christ still wields in human life? When men are living selfish, unspiritual, worldly lives, what is it that convinces us of sin but the holy self-sacrificing life of Jesus insinuating itself into our consciences, and rousing us to a sense of higher things? When we are estranged from God and are living as orphans in a Fatherless world, what is it that breaks down the wall of partition and makes us children of our Father's Home, but the name of Jesus, the Mediator between God and man? When our hearts become the home of evil thoughts and impure fancies, what is it that drives out the evil brood and brings in the holy dove of purity, but the name of Him whose purity was the purity of Heaven? When the pulse of our spiritual life is slow and feeble, what is it that inspires us with the energy of new life, and stimulates us to run the race set before us, but the name of Him who endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, and died that we might live? It is the power of Christ that nourishes our holiest feelings, that moulds our highest purposes, and sustains our noblest efforts, and it is the power of Christ that sweetens the breath of society and imparts to life what best makes it worth living.

In the history of the Church with its moral and spiritual triumphs we have a witness to the power of Christ which corroborates what the New Testament tells us about him, and a witness which no discussion on the origin of the books of the New Testament can ever invalidate. It is incumbent upon a historical student to find a cause sufficient to explain the rise of the Christian Church and the extraordinary influence the name of Christ has exercised on human history. A Jesus of Nazareth, such as Strauss or Renan draws for us, gives us no cause sufficient to produce the effects. Judging from the course of human history since the birth of Jesus, and even without a New Testament in our hands at all, we should be forced to postulate some such extraordinary personal power as the New Testament speaks of, to account for the plain historical facts. Given such a cause as the personal power of the divinely human life of Jesus, as portrayed in the gospels, we can explain the historical problem of the rise and power of the Christian Church; without such a cause the problem remains insoluble. Thus does the witness of history confirm the conclusion of the best biblical criticism

that our gospels give us a faithful historical portrait of the life of Jesus of Nazareth.

Having seen that the revelation given in Christianity is the revelation of the moral and spiritual power of the life and death of Christ, let us ask what evidence there is that this revelation is of God.

The evidence is just Christ Himself. If you ask what evidence I have that the sun is shining, I can but point you to the sun in the heavens. If you ask me what evidence there is that Christ is of God, I can but bid you look to Christ Himself. He is his own evidence. There he is in the closeness of his fellowship with the Father, in the wonderfulness of his love, the beauty of his holiness, and the fulness of his spiritual power, cleansing men from the stains of sin, purifying their hearts by faith, inspiring them with new enthusiasms.

Coleridge once said in his paradoxical way—In order to an efficient belief in Christianity a man must be Christian. It is at any rate true that in order to appreciate the evidence of Christianity which is Christ Himself a man must have some affinity with his character. Goethe said, To see the sun, the eye must be sunny; so to feel the evidence Christ Himself supplies that Christianity is of God, a man must in some measure be Christ-like. If a man cannot feel the wonderfulness of Christ's life, we can only say of Him what Plato said of the materialists of his day, who could not appreciate the evidence for a spiritual world, "they must first be made better men."

Where the heart has not become hardened, debased by sin, there is an instinctive recognition of the high origin of the revelation that is given in the life of Christ. As the daisy will turn on its stalk towards the sun that enriches and beautifies it, so does every true soul turn to the Son of righteousness. In a French author,* I find the following remarkable illustration. The speakers are missionaries in Thibet: "A young Chinese doctor arrived at the village where we were staying and led a life so strange that every one called him the Chinese hermit. He never went out but to visit the sick and usually he went only to the poor. The rich solicited him in vain, he would not respond to their invitation. The time which was not occupied in gratuitous visits to the sick, he spent in study. He slept little, and each day took only a single diet of barley meal. One had only to see him to be convinced

* Quoted by M. Godet.

that he led a hard, painful life; his face was extremely lean and pale, and although he was only 30 years of age, his hair was perfectly white. He came one day to see us while we were reading prayers in our little chapel; he stopped a little way from the door and waited in silence. A large picture representing the crucifixion had doubtless drawn his attention, for as soon as we had finished prayers he asked us abruptly, and without the usual salutations, to explain the meaning of the picture. When we had acceded to his request, he crossed his arms over his breast, and without saying a single word, he remained motionless with his eyes fixed on the figure of the crucifixion. He kept this position for half an hour. His eyes at last began to fill with tears; he stretched out his arms towards the Christ of the picture, then fell on his knees, struck the earth three times with his forehead and rose exclaiming 'There is the only one whom men ought to adore.'"

Let us bear well in mind that the chief claim Christianity makes upon us is not the acceptance of abstract doctrine about God and man. It presents to us Christ in his power to reconcile us to God, to purify our thoughts and aspirations, and to mould our character into the likeness of his own, and claims our allegiance to Him, simply on the ground of what He is. Here is a divinely human life, itself its best evidence, shining with the brightness of its own light, proving itself to him who has eyes to see to be as certainly of God as the sunshine is of the sun. Such a life, by the mere fact of its existence, constitutes a claim upon us we cannot put by. If we are brought into contact with the life of a friend who is purer and nobler than ourselves, his very presence lays us under an obligation to rise to his level. How much more does the presence of Christ lay us under an obligation to give ourselves to be moulded by his purifying and sanctifying power!

We may trouble ourselves about this and that difficulty in the Bible, object to this and that doctrine of some human creed, distrust this or that evidence adduced by defenders of the faith, but after all what we have to do with is the one great evidence, Christ Himself. To believe in him, to yield ourselves to the spell of his personal influence, to get near God through his Spirit, to be growing in purity and depth of affection, in spiritual beauty and moral fervour through fellowship with him, that is the claim that the very existence of Christ's life in our midst makes upon us, and that is a claim that is independent of any difficulties that may be raised regarding the Christian revelation.

This, moreover, I will venture to say, when we have rightly settled the claim that Christ's life makes upon our hearts, we shall be better able to deal with the difficulties that trouble our heads. When we consider how great the course of human history has proved Christ to be, and when we feel in our own experience how great he is to ourselves, it will not be hard to believe that he actually performed the miracles the New Testament records. From such a cause as Christ, from such transcendent moral and spiritual power as we know was at work in his life, what effects might we not expect? The wonderful thing would be if from such an extraordinary cause no extraordinary effects were produced. Nor will the inspiration and authority of Scripture be such stumbling blocks in our way; Christ's own words we will devoutly treasure as the words of Him who not only knew the truth, but was Himself the truth, and the words of His disciples and Apostles we will treasure as the words of those who were nearer the source of light, and directly under the power of his spirit. And so with many other difficulties that may trouble us. The more we understand of the wonderful power of the life of Christ, the more will intellectual difficulties altogether vanish, or, at all events, the less will they trouble us.

In conclusion, whatever difficulties there may be about what are termed the evidences of Christianity, the one great evidence—the character and life and influence of Christ remains unshaken and unshakeable. The old way of presenting some of the evidences, *e.g.*, the attempt to prove Christ from his miracles, instead of proving the miracles from Christ, may have to be given up. But the Church need not regret that some of the old arguments now fail to convince unbelievers, for the truest evidence for Christianity never lay there, but in Christ Himself; and this indeed is the true work of the Church, to present to men Christ Himself, Christ as he lived in Palestine, Christ as he has lived in history, Christ as he still lives in the ennobled and purified members of His Church. When the Church is manifesting the power of Christ in her own life, she is putting forth evidences for Christianity far more telling than subtle apologetic arguments can ever be. Here the Church is resting on a foundation that can never be removed. Many of the apologetic arguments that seem to be convincing now may one day lose their force, but no change that comes over apologetic arguments can ever affect the reality and power of the life and character of Christ as a great factor in human history. Even were critics to prove that some

of the books of the New Testament have no right to a place in the canon, Christianity remains the same, for Christianity is Christ, and Christ as a new element let down into human life, is a force that nothing in heaven or earth can destroy. Men of science tell us that no smallest amount of physical energy can be annihilated. It may be changed from one form into another, from heat into electricity, from electricity into light—but it can never be lost. The same law of the conservation of energy holds good in the spiritual world. Spiritual power is never lost but goes on doing its work, now in one form now in another. From age to age, Christ as a wholly new power that has been let down into human life, must of necessity continue to work in the world. It is a sheer impossibility that the spiritual energy of his life can ever be destroyed. Having come into the world, it must ever continue and ever work. "The world itself is changed," says Horace Bushnell, "and it is no more the same that it was; it has never been the same since Jesus left it. The air is charged with heavenly odours, and a kind of celestial consciousness, as sense of other worlds is wafted on us in its breath. Let the dark ages come, let society roll backward and Churches perish in whole regions of the earth, let infidelity deny and what is worse, let spurious piety dishonour the truth; still there is a something here that was not, and something that has immortality in it. Still our confidence remains unshaken that Christ and His all-quickening life are in the world as fixed elements, and will be to the end of time, for Christianity is not so much the advent of a better doctrine as of a perfect character; and how can a perfect character, once entered into life and history, be separated and finally expelled? It were easier to untwist all the beams of light in the sky, separating and expunging one of the colours, than to get the character of Jesus, which is the real gospel, out of the world."

D. M. Ross.

HOW AND WHY TO READ.

In this paper I take for granted that the subject with which it deals is a great one, and that all needing to be known about it cannot be well enough learned in the Primary School. Indeed, I assume that the subject is no less vast than vitally important, and would plead in justification that three very great, and very different men,

Maurice, Schopenhauer and Ruskin, thought it worth while to write earnestly and thoughtfully upon it, but never dreamed that they had exhausted it. My chief aim is to say over again a little of what they have already said. I do not pretend to add anything valuable of my own. My little paper is for such as have not read their writings upon this topic. Those who have will doubtless be wise enough to save themselves the trouble of reading mine.

In all things, but especially in writing, the great difficulty is to make a beginning. Luckily for me my title enables me to break ground at once. Most people seem to think that they are safe in feeling satisfied, if they have found out *what* they should read. Learned men are asked day after day by this one and that and the other, "What book do you advise me to study?" Much rarer is the question, "*How* should I read?" And this question, when it is put, generally means little more than "By what means can I most quickly and easily get the main facts of this book stowed away in my memory?" for purposes of show-off or examination, according as Pedant or Philistine happens to be the speaker. As to the second question, "*Why* should I read?" "To pass away time," "To acquire information," "Not to have to confess that you haven't," and "Because if you don't you'll be plucked," are answers quite commonly given and, without any misgiving, accepted as sound and sensible. Yet the failing to put these questions and to answer them or get them answered, as they ought to be put and to be answered, is followed by fearful and wonderful consequences. Like every other function, physical or spiritual, when wrongly exercised, perverted reading is fruitful of monsters. I go on to consider a few of these, premising only that I have in view readers of what is ordinarily understood by Literature alone, not students of physical science, the rules of whose art I do not pretend to know.

First then there is the Bookworm. I use this word in a strict sense, not with its ordinary loose meaning. The animal so called is a creature which goes through books, and through which according to its capacity more or less of the books goes. Just so there is a class of people whose reading, as they themselves describe it, is a "going through" books, with the result that the contents of the books pass through, or rather over their minds, and "leave not a rack behind," or at best very little more than a rack. With perseverance unto the end, they conscientiously plod or rush right through bulky volumes from Preface to Finis, mentally as much awake as the regulation tourist, who snores through the finest scenery, and

yawns through historic cathedrals, and then, sighing the sigh of triumphant relief, adds the "Grand Tour" to the score of his merits. Ask him about his travels, and he runs you over a list of stations and picture galleries. Such too often is the mode of doing the Grand Tours of Literature. Many a man can rehearse you a fine long catalogue of lands and cities traversed in that fair world, and loves to weary you with vague and irrelevant raptures about them. But what has he brought home with him? *Vox et praetérea nihil.* Invariably the parrot-like unintelligence, and overdone fervour with which they declaim the now traditional eulogies of the great ones of the past, the eager ostentation with which they parade the lengthy catalogue of their studies, and the sense of virtuous superiority with which they look down upon those who have not similarly "gone through" the classics, betray plainly enough this class of readers.

Next we have the Burden-bearer or Dyspeptic. This is the reader with whom study is a means not of improving the whole mind, but of stuffing the memory. As Schopenhauer says, he is like a workman who, instead of setting up his ladder and ascending its rounds unheedingly leaving one after another behind him, lays it down along the ground, and taking out the rounds one by one, piles them upon his back, rejoicing as the weight increases, and always remaining just as high as he was at the first. Or he is like the man, who, forgetting that only as much food as is digested and assimilated does any good to the body, so gorges his stomach that the peptic functions are all but completely paralysed. These two comparisons foreshew to us what in fact we find to be the result of this kind of study. The burden-bearer cannot but be slow in his movements, so much the slower, the more he has to carry. And the man who labours under a very dust-bin of a memory, into which wagon-load after wagon-load of fact-and-nonsense rubbish has been carted, is always provokingly, insufferably slow in the use of his mental faculties for independent thought or practical business. Habitual surfeiting with food makes nerveless and inelastic limbs; they lack exercise, for the work of the stomach engrosses most of the man's strength, and they lack nourishment, for the over drudged stomach does its work so badly. Similarly incessant cramming of the memory, while it cheats the other powers of the mind out of their legitimate exercise, fails at the same time to supply them with their necessary nourishment. A clear proof that such reading neither enriches,

invigorates, nor enlightens, is presented by the judgments and opinions which these "dungeons of learning" may be incidentally called upon to form out of their own spiritual resources, their memory happening not to furnish them with any such ready-made. Such self-formed judgments and opinions are almost invariably marked by the same prejudice, narrowness, and want of insight and sympathy which characterize the views and tastes of the illiterate vulgar. To this class, in truth, those people of whom I speak belong, for in them everything but the memory is illiterate, rude, and unformed; and consequently when they are forced to speak what is their own, they say what is of but little worth. They are like owners of lands beneath which are buried vast seams of unmined coal and shale, but who when a fire or a light is wanted, have to shiver over a few sticks, or half-see by a farthing rushlight like the poorest of their landless neighbours.

Again there is the Empty Barrel, *viz.* Gun-barrel. It must be admitted that this is not a very fine name; but it describes fairly enough a large class of so-called educated people, who ought to have some distinctive name and do not deserve a more complimentary one. This title does not undeservedly libel any ancient nation as "Philistine" does, and it is more expressive. Once these people were loaded and primed, then, as Sandy Mackaye says, they were fired off, hitting or missing, and now there is nothing in them. Once they were thoroughly "coached" with text-books, keys, summaries, notes, "questions likely to be asked;" then they passed or failed, and henceforth have cared for none of these things. Such men are likely to be numerous enough so long as our University systems continue to be so marvellously adapted to stimulate the first part of the process, and Nature, who, judging from her "order," certainly does not abhor a mental vacuum, cheerfully consents to the last. I do not try to inquire here what mental faculties are in use, and how they are used while loading or "coaching" is in progress. Apparently the process is not only unnatural, as is proved by the almost instantaneous obliteration of its results, but exceedingly painful. For those whose studies have been of this kind for the most part not only let go what they have once after a fashion acquired; but, for the post-examination remainder of their lives, hate books intensely. No horsey man shews anything like that aversion to study, which is seldom wanting in the man who has "ground" a subject hard for a "pass," without love or true intelligence. This ignorance and abhorrence are sometimes boastingly confessed,

but generally the "passed" man of this description honestly considers himself an authority upon no end of subjects, and gives himself airs accordingly, feeling in duty bound at the same time to make every possible effort to show a love for books—short of actually reading them. Another all but invariable characteristic of this class of quondam students is their spiritual vulgarity. They are feverish with the ambitions, fretful with the jealousies, elated with the flummeries, which make up life for the most commercially minded of those who are worthy indeed of the title vulgar, but not of the monopoly of it. For nobody so entirely deserves it as the "educated" man whose education has not raised him above finding his life and peace in the multitude of the things which he himself has, or the death of his peace in the greater multitude which belongs to another.

Further we often meet with the man of many spectacles. For Be-spectacled would be in the case of many a man a much more truthfully descriptive epithet than either educated, or cultured, or enlightened. Now spectacles may be a very useful thing, when they help a man to see what defects of sight would otherwise leave dim or invisible to him. But spectacles which let him see little but their own colours can scarcely be held to add much to either his penetration or range of view. Yet with many a man as regards the world of mind, something of this sort has actually come to be the case. He can see nothing except his spectacles. He has theories about everything. He does not reach these by induction from observed facts. He persuades himself of them from books, and comes with them to the facts and if the facts do not agree with them, so much the worse for the facts. Not that he ever becomes aware of such disagreement; his theories are too many for him, they do not let him get a sight of the facts. All our knowledge is relative, the philosophers tell us. Truly with many a man a great deal of labour has for result merely a raising of this relativity to the second or third power.

Physical science has brought the naked eye into a certain contempt; so many things are "invisible of course to the naked eye." But in justice it must be admitted that she does not do this while offering no better help than coloured spectacles, green, or blue, or what you like. And after all the microscope is intended just to bring the naked eye to bear upon things. In the soul the naked eye is the only instrument available, and the more naked, the more purely objective the spiritual eye is, the better. Now so far as

culture is concerned theories may be helpful enough. Looked at and compared with realities they may become to a man truths livingly possessed, or at the best an index and stimulus to the attainment of such. To use Maurice's words they may become illuminations, not mere acquisitions. But accepted without verification by each man for himself, and looked *through*, they are veils, blinds. True or untrue, they are now mere films, films of some other man's subjectivity, which the student interposes between himself and the objective realities of the world. Culture ought to confer the power of looking with the naked eye, with the unprejudiced mind, with vision unperturbed by wrong feeling, unrefracted by wrong thought, at all theories and all facts. But in the case of many a man, hard study simply fastens over the already bescaled eye, the already prejudiced soul, the extra blind of certain theories, which, I repeat, though they may be luminous and illumining truths when rightly used, become downright prejudices, dimming spectacles of the spiritual perception, when misused. I have heard of a certain elderly professor, who whenever he looked up from his lecture-book to make explanatory remarks, pushed his glasses up over his forehead. Explanations over, being somewhat absent-minded, he would first feel on the desk for his glasses, and then recollecting, pull them down again and resume his reading. Observing this, a mischievous student contrived one day to get unnoticed behind the old man's chair, having provided himself with a stock of spectacles such as he used. Then every time the professor pushed up his glasses to talk, another pair was quietly laid down on his desk, which he unthinkingly put on. These in turn went up and were similarly replaced, and so on till to the amusement of his wicked class the old man's crown was thoroughly roofed. Yet he would have seemed, and would have been much more ridiculous, had he put all these pairs of spectacles one in front of the other upon his nose. But this is what the man of theories virtually does, without being thought or feeling himself ridiculous at all. As might be expected, the striking peculiarity of this kind of readers is their sense of omniscience and infallibility. They have views about everything that is "in the heaven above or in the earth beneath, or in the waters that are under the earth," and are unshakeably convinced that their opinions must be right, and everybody else's wrong. Like Mr. Chubb they "have one fundamental division for all opinion,—"my idea,"—of course *they* don't say "idee," and "humbug." A story is told of Carlyle which ought to be authentic.

Its exact form and where I heard or read it, I cannot remember, but in substance it is as follows. At a dinner Carlyle sat opposite a "brilliant conversationalist" who laid down the law, cleared up all difficulties, and solved all problems with equal ease and "cock-sureness." The sage long possessed his soul in patience, but at last when he could stand no more, leaned a little forward and said pityingly to the oracle, "Man, you're a puir cratur." Poor creatures, indeed, these men of spectacles, all are.

Another kind of readers may, for want of a more accurately descriptive name, be termed Unreal. This unreality is not the unreality of the mere theorist, and is of very varying degrees, only the worst of which, of course, deserve to be discussed as examples of spiritual monstrosity. For this mood of mind is met with often enough in men of lofty and many-sided culture, and not only that but of genuine moral earnestness and practical aspirations, as well as in men who morally and intellectually have degenerated into mere playthings of their own morbid and extravagant fancy. Still, they have something in common. The theorist is a man who thinks, he knows all about actual things, and therefore feels himself above the need of inquiring closely into them. On the other hand, what characterizes those people of whom I now speak, is a nervous shrinking from the touch of life as it is, a lack of interest in its affairs, and a sense of timid helplessness, when there is no escape from taking an active part in them. In the latter of the two classes I have mentioned, this mood is just what is to be expected. For these are the readers of novels, nothing but novels, and novels of the worst kind, Fashionable, Sensational, Psychological, Yellow-backed, Green-backed, *et hoc genus omne*. Of all such books Schopenhauer most truly says,—"They make doubly hard this difficulty, (*i.e.*, of learning what the true nature and course of the world is) in itself a hard enough one. For they exhibit the course of events and the conduct of men, as these never actually are.........Thus into the place of want of knowledge, a merely negative state, steps positive error in the shape of a whole tissue of false pre-suppositions. And this confuses the teaching of experience herself, and makes her lessons appear in a false light. If the youth before walked in darkness, he is now led astray by Will-o'-the-Wisps; and still more frequently is it so with the maiden. Unawares they receive from novels an utterly false view of life, and expectations are aroused, which can never be fulfilled. This rarely fails to influence most hurtfully their whole life. So that men such as artisans and the like, who

in their youth have neither time nor opportunity for novel-reading, enjoy thereby a great advantage." In like manner Maurice, in speaking of this sort of novels and their readers, says that they minister "to the desire to be startled with events and combinations of events which are never likely to happen,—there being nothing, it would seem, in the actual world of human beings, or in the world of nature, which can cause us any wonder." While reading such books, a man's mind is necessarily out of time with reality, and with a sufficiency of such perverse practice, this discord quickly becomes inveterate. Thus to be normally in abnormal and unnatural dissonance with the world of men as they are, becomes second nature. Intermediate between these and those whom I mentioned first, is a pretty numerous class of men whose studies are unreal and result in unreality, because they are utterly selfish. The classical portraiture of the student of this kind, may be found in Tennyson's Palace of Art. Of him, therefore, I need say no more beyond remarking that the fact that study, so faultless in all but the moral element, nevertheless turns out to be so faulty, shews how fatally untrue must be the view of those who make reading purely a business of the head, not at all of the heart. To this subject I shall return again. But how are we to explain the unreality of men who not only like the Builder of the Palace of Art study real books, but, unlike him, do so with vitally moral intent? Often no doubt, this tendency to aloofness from the practical is a natural weakness of the spiritual constitution, but quite as often is it brought upon a man by himself through want of care. For the fact is that, however real be the book we are reading, our imagination in picturing the world with which it deals, unless both sternly restrained, and perseveringly urged on, alike goes beyond and stops short of reality. Consider how we read history. Are we not too prone to picture to ourselves the life of the past as wanting that commonplaceness which the present has for us, and which that past must have had too, if it ever was present? And are we not likewise prone to picture the past as having had, so to speak, on its very surface those ideal elements, which, in matter of fact, long ago just as now, were visible only to faith and insight, and just as invisible then as now to the man who failed to exert these. Now, such lack of the commonplace, and obviousness of the ideal is no necessary element in an imaginative picture as compared with present reality. We can quite well imagine a state of things as commonplace, and apparently as little ideal as our own immediate surroundings, however

prosaic these may be. We do so every time we read a Newspaper. We neither omit nor idealize in bringing the scenes and events it describes, before our eyes. But in reading a history, or a novel of real life such as one of George Eliot's, insensibly we allow our imagination to work differently. Its pictures shew themselves to us, as it were, in a different light; for I may vaguely indicate the difference between these two contrasted aspects of life as imaged in fancy, by saying that the Newspaper scenes appear in sunlight, those of the history or the novel in moonlight. But consider the effect of this carelessness and forgetfulness, or, it may be, timidity of imagination. Hereby from the study of the most useful of all books, real history, real fiction, real poetry, many of us fail to gain the good that we might. What they ought to do for us is to enable us to see that in life exactly like our own, superficially as petty and as stale, mighty forces work and deep meanings may be discovered. But in reading them we imagine a world with a different atmosphere from our own, and accordingly fail to learn the art of finding in our own time and circumstances, lighted and coloured as they appear to us, what Carlyle, George Eliot and Tennyson reveal as the essence of the life they depict. Beguiled by the glamour with which our fancy invests the scenes we read of, we hardly expect to find the same greatness as is revealed in them, in our own life and surroundings, which we cannot, of course, thus falsely glorify. And thus, though fervently anxious to make better the world in which our lot has been cast, we shrink from it and despair of it, because in our blindness we think too meanly of it.

My meaning in the above paragraph will perhaps be illustrated if I add that, so far as can be judged from their Roman plays, Ben Jonson must have read Roman history in the one, and Shakespeare in the other of the two ways I have tried to describe. Ben Jonson's Roman dramas are to a certain extent unreal, because he did not imagine and therefore has not ventured to represent Romans and their life as after all cast in pretty much the same mould as the men and the times he had experience of. Shakespeare had no such scruples, and therefore his Romans and their life are thoroughly human, and, doubtless, in all but petty details truly Roman..

But to return. I ask in the last place,—what of those whose reading does unquestionably make them more able and practically effective men, hard thinkers, persuasive reasoners, ready-witted and sagacious advisers, resolute, business-like workers, men, who, far from letting go this world in order to dream of another, think this

a very good world, capable, too, of being made much better both for themselves and others? And this, accordingly, not delaying, and not hurrying, and not blundering, they set themselves to do. These men read nothing that is not somehow turned to account. History teaches them statesmanship; political economy affords them practical hints about business; logic sharpens their wits; the drama and the novel help them to read character, and to manage their neighbours. Beyond a doubt such men read well. Their study is known by its fruits, and these are good. On this very subject Burke wrote to his son,—"Reading, and much reading, is good. But the power of diversifying the matter infinitely in your own mind, and of applying it to every occasion that arises, is far better; so do not suppress the *vivida vis.*" And this is just the guiding principle that the men I speak of, with happy instinctiveness or steadfast prudence remember and act up to, and thereby become what they are,—men of insight and resource and energy, men who prosper themselves, and are useful to their neighbours. Certainly this aim is high, and the method by which it is reached must be genuinely good; to be such a man is very desirable. But is there no more excellent way? Is such a man's aim the highest, his methods the best, his state the most enviable? Or is there a loftier ideal to which even the reader of humblest capacity may aspire, a more thorough method which even he may be strong enough to use, a more all-round human completeness to which in his measure he may attain? I think there is. If we extend, as we may with perfect truth, to the type of student I have above described, the words in which the poet delineates the man, who to many would seem a model scientist, we shall see clearly both the strength and the weakness of this method of study.

"He gathers knowledge hour by hour,
  Forgetting nought that once he knew,
And handling it with conscious power
  As matter certified and true;
And all he knows gives added might
  That still with harder thought combines;
We wonder at the shining light,
  He wonders less the more it shines!
He has slight pity for our pain,
  For weakness, he has none at all;
He is not proud, he is not vain;
  He is not either great or small;

But he is strong and hard and clear
As is a frosty winter day,
And never sheds an idle tear,
Nor flings an idle word away."

Such a man we see, with all his practical effectiveness of thought and act, may be wanting in sympathy, in reverence, in sense of mystery. And because men have hearts, and are the creatures and children of the invisible God, in these things lies the greatness of the greatest of men, and no less the duty and felicity of the least. All methods of study, therefore, by which we do not grow in these, fall short of being the best. And only if there be such a method of reading as secures this development, can books be regarded as means of culture or education in any worthy meaning of the words. But if Milton be right in saying that books "contain a potencie of life in them to be as active as that soul whose progeny they are;" that a good book "is the pretious life-blood of a master-spirit, imbalmed, and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life," such a method there must be, and surely one not very hard to discover, or painful to follow. Nor will those of us fail to seek and find it who are deeply conscious that,

"'Tis life of which our veins are scant,
More life, and fuller that we want."

It must seem that after all that has been said, we have not yet got very far. "We started, no doubt, with the question in hand," my readers may say, "but we are just starting still. Our inquiry was to be after the right aim and method of reading, but as yet we have heard only something about wrong and defective ends and ways." Well, so be it. Let us sum up our results, such as they are. We are not to read cursorily in order that we may pander to the vanity of talking and feeling big. We are not to regard learning simply as the "fine cow in the stall, that gives us butter to our bread," and accordingly to content ourselves, if by hook or crook we can get the name of possessing it; actually we are to refuse for ourselves the benefits of that fundamental principle of modern civilisation, that for bread and butter purposes, the sham with a little management should bear quite as "solid vally" as the reality, and that the M. A. should be a very marketable commodity in the total absence of a mastery of any art except artifice and audacity. We are not merely to exercise our memory and store it with information, nor by appropriating the ready-made thoughts of others, save ourselves the trouble of thinking and inquiring into things

themselves. We are not to allow our sojourn in the world of books to inspire distaste for the world and the age in which we have been appointed to live and to do. Nay, we are not to feel perfectly satisfied even when our reading makes us clearer and more practical thinkers, and more efficient workers in the actual business of life. Must it not be owned that instead of being decisions of small moment, instead of being light demands upon us, these sound very much like counsels of perfection? Yet, be this as it may, Milton's words have surely led us to hope that any man who chooses may so read as more and more adequately to fulfil these counsels, and to rise ever from higher to higher, not only in knowing and doing, but in being as well.

W. McCulloch.

CHILD-MARRIAGE AND ENFORCED WIDOWHOOD, I.*

There are many social questions that are now coming to the front in India. Some are sanitory, and relate to the public health, such as those connected with the great gatherings at religious fairs and festivals, which so often generate disease. Others have an economic bearing, such as the inordinate expenditure at weddings, which burdens families for life, and impoverishes the country. Others, again, go deeper, and have a moral and religious significance; the education of the masses, caste, caste inter-marriages, child-marriage and widowhood, re-marriage, the position of woman in general, female education, and the education of native opinion —in distinction from educated opinion—in order to deal adequately with all these subjects.

Pre-eminently does the idea of *a home* need to be developed in Native society; for the home should be the cradle of all great movements, the fountain whence thought and life and regeneration should flow to larger social circles and to the nation. But this can never be till *woman's* place in the family is recognised, and her power is felt in the home for good. Instead of this, the exchange of thoughts with a woman on social and religious questions is never dreamt of and indeed no time is allotted for the mem-

* The substance of this paper has recently been delivered as a Lecture at Bangalore, Madras, Salem, Bellary, Gooty. Cuddapah, Trichinopoly, Tanjore, Kombakonum, and other places.

bers of a Hindu family to meet together. How can a woman who is shut up all day be a suitable companion for her husband and elder sons? Yet until the women are taken into confidence, social reforms on any general scale are impossible, since the deepest and saddest of the social problems of India centre in woman. Professor Monier Williams has said, in his Introduction to "Indian Wisdom"*:—"It is not too much to affirm that the evils arising from the degradation of women, or at least the assumption of their supposed inferiority in the great religious systems of the East, constitute the principal bar to the progress and elevation of Asiatic nations." And Mr. Gladstone has somewhere observed :—"When we are seeking to ascertain the measure of that conception which any given race has formed of our nature, there is perhaps no single test so effective as the position which it assigns to women."

In dealing with the social questions of the day, we shall surely do right, then, to begin with woman; and we come at once to the great open sore of the country, the crying evil of the age, the *fons et origo* of all the other evils—Child-Marriage and Enforced Widowhood.

But a European necessarily labours under disadvantage in handling questions of this kind, owing to his practical ignorance of the secret construction, the inner details, of domestic life in India; and without a knowledge of these, the subject cannot be properly mastered in all its bearings, and errors of judgment are liable to occur. From such errors here unwittingly committed, the Hindu reader is asked to grant absolution. It has been well said that after an Englishman has been a year in this country, he thinks he knows the Hindus thoroughly; after he has been here three years, he feels he does not know them quite so well; and when he has lived among the people twenty years, he confesses he knows practically very little about them at all. It is Hindus themselves who must study these difficult questions and write and speak about them, for they know and *feel* the evils that wait to be removed. And a foreigner would scarcely venture to approach this great national question, and address Hindus on one of their immemorial customs—always a delicate matter—had not unmistakable signs appeared, in such pamphlets as those of Mr. Malabari of Bombay and Dewan Bahadur Ragunath Row of Madras, and in other ways, that the educated men of India are now ripe for a

* P. xlv. 2nd Ed.

full discussion of the subject, and for the free interchange of Indian and European thoughts.

Let us then first examine the reasons commonly adduced *for* the practice of child-marriage; secondly, we shall state the reasons *against* it; after which we may glance at some of the possible *remedies*.

It is true that child-marriages are theoretically confined to Brahmans, though the Nambari Brahmans of Travancore are a conspicuous exception to the rule; but the Chettis and Silk-Weavers, and some other castes of South India, also adopt the custom; while all over the country, not even excepting the Native Christian community, there has been a tendency among all classes to imitate the custom.

The most serious reasons advanced for the practice are from the side of religion and morality.

First, then, let us look at its *religious* basis. Marriage among Hindus is not a civil institution, as it is among Muhammadans, it is a sacrament, or, according to Manu, one of the twelve Sanskāra, or purificatory rites, (II. 27 &c.,) by which a person is purified from hereditary sin; and which are enjoined, with certain variations, on the three classes of Hindus—Brāhmans, Kshatriyas, and Vaiśyas. It is a religious duty, specially incumbent upon women, and performed for religious ends; and it affects the religious state of man, both here and hereafter. It is this that makes the question so difficult to deal with, especially to one of another faith. For it is always a delicate matter when we come to discuss one another's religion. We have a reverent regard for the religious spirit of every land, and believe that every great religion has been built on truth, and has served some Divine purpose in the progressive history of the world. But child-marriage is related rather to the ceremonial side of Hinduism, and to the interpretation of certain texts; and these may surely be considered, without raising the suspicion of any hostile designs against the Hindu faith.

The supposed *religious* basis of child-marriage, as we understand it, is two-fold:—

(*a*) The authority of the S'ástras:

(*b*) The doctrine of the S'rāddha.

(*a*) It is not surprising that people should cling with tenacity to customs supposed to be sanctioned by ancient religious authority; and it has been said that in India every custom, whether unintelligible, or positively indefensible, becomes a religious question. Dewan

Bahadur R. Ragunath Row has probably said all that can be said on this subject in the two editions of his pamphlet "The Hindu Law on Marriage," published first in 1882, and in his Reply to a Review of that pamphlet by two learned Madhava pandits, as well as in some more recent papers; and his countrymen must read and judge for themselves. This Sanskrit scholar and earnest reformer claims to have proved from the Hindu sacred books that marriage is *optional,* though the unmarried are entitled to the highest heavens; that the pair should *consent* to be married; that at the time of marriage they must be *of age*; that the marriageable age of a boy is not less than his 16th year, and of a girl not less than her 11th year; that no change in civil status takes place *until* the bride has been made one with the bridegroom in *gotra* or *gens,* by actual union; and that a marriage contract ceases to be in force the moment one of the couple is *dead* or *becomes an apostate.* The last two principles have great legal significance; and, because the second of them has been over-ridden by the Statute laws of the British Courts, serious evils and miseries have been inflicted on many of the Native Christians of India, who, married in childhood to Hindu or Mussulman husbands, have, on becoming Christians, been outcasted, but are unable to form new alliances.

On the re-marriage question, as it touches Hindus, Mr. Ragunath Row claims to have proved that a virgin widow may be married more than once, with Vedic marital rites, but without them, if she be a non-virgin; and that the children of such are legitimate. A long array of Sanskrit texts is cited in support of these positions; and few will care to deny that they are now open questions; and that further examination may conclusively show that the evil practices of child-marriage and enforced widowhood have not the sanction of the S'āstras.

A few texts uttered by one or two of the ancient sages are sometimes quoted to prove the antiquity of the custom; but Manu is accounted "the best of all the commentators of the Vedas," as well as "the first and best of Hindu law-givers"; and our own study of his Institutes leads to an agreement with Mr. Ragunath Row. There are two or three passages that deserve special notice. In chapter IX, verse 94, it is said*:—"A man, aged 30 years, may marry a girl of 12, if he find one dear to his heart; or a man of 24 years, a damsel of 8." That is to say, Manu simply *permits*

---

* Sir William Jones's Translation.

early marriages, within certain limits, or, what is more probable, he intended the *gift* of girls from their 8th year, and not their marriage; because the girl was required to *desire* a married life, which is a choice that can scarcely be exercised under 10. Manu certainly does not command early marriage, he does not prohibit later marriages; the man of 30 *may* marry a girl of 12, he may not marry one younger; and he may marry, "*if he find one dear to his heart*," which surely involves *choice*, and cannot be consistent with contracts made in infancy by parents or guardians. The youngest age, here set down, at which a man may marry is 24; so that *boy*-marriages, now so common, are absolutely forbidden.

Again, in the same chapter, verses 88, 89, it is said:—"To an excellent and handsome youth of the same class, let every man give his daughter in marriage, according to law. But it is better that the damsel, though marriageable, should *stay at home till her death*, than that he should ever give her in marriage to a bridegroom *void of excellent qualities*." It is no shame, then, for a girl to remain unmarried at 15, or 20, or 30; indeed she is enjoined by Manu to do so, *unless* she can find a husband possessed "of excellent qualities"; and how hard that husband is to find, let the women of India and of England tell us! We see that the marriage ceremony may thus be indefinitely delayed. And does not this, again, clearly condemn early betrothals of mere infants by parents or guardians? for how can they tell that the boy will afterwards be possessed "of excellent qualities;" and if he be not, the girl is forbidden to marry him! Manu's teaching, rightly carried out, would thus lead, according to present custom, to children rebelling against the decision of their elders. In another place, (IX. 90,) Manu allows a woman to *choose* a husband for herself, if no one has been found for her before the age of 13.* We thus see how far removed is Manu's teaching from those hard and fast rules that have been held as binding on Hindu society for centuries.

But we have no desire to undertake the exposition and vindication of the religious books of India. Hindus can see to that much better themselves, and happy will it be for them and for their books if they can conclusively prove that they do *not*

---

* In addition to this text, there are several others to be found in the Smritis, which prove that the ancient choice of a husband by a maiden, as often depicted in the Epic poems, was quite familiar to the compilers. Professor Jolly of Würtzburg University, Tagore Law Lecturer in Calcutta, and translator of Nārada's Institutes, cites the following texts which may be consulted:—*Yagnavalkya* i. 64: *Vishnu* xxiv. 40: *Gautama* xviii, 20: *Narada* xii. 22. (See *Indian Evangelical Review* for April 1885, p. 411.)

require them to break the laws of health and reason and morality. If they do require it, so much the worse for the laws, and all one can say is that such laws cannot have been inspired; at any rate they can have no binding inspiration and authority for those who now admit these evils. A book of laws, however sacred it may be held, ceases to be of abiding authority, if those laws are out of harmony with intellectual, social and moral progress. Any law based on the unaltering nature and needs of man, *i.e.*, any true natural and moral law, can never pass away; it is necessarily final and eternal. But laws that are only arbitrary and temporary—laws that have been based on passing customs—are destined to give way before the pressure of growing life. If a religion and religious laws can only boast of antiquity; if they are plainly unsuited to the present age, and to the progress of the world, they have lost their claim to the allegiance of the men and women living now. If one could be shown that anything in the New Testament clashed with the laws of conscience and with the rights of man; if it required one to do that which he knew to be an evil and a wrong, it would have no authority for him. As for the ceremonial laws of the Old Testament, which correspond in some respects with the ancient Hindu laws, Christians are not bound by them, for they belonged to an age long since gone by. And the releasing spirit of the New Testament, which has superseded the Old, and which stands in much the same relation to all old laws and old religions as it stood to the ancient Hebrew—*i.e.*, as their interpreter, fulfiller, or emancipator—waits for the enlightened acceptance of the nations. Ancient lawgivers, such as Moses, Manu, Lycurgus, Draco, framed laws suited to the requirements of an *ancient* people, who were for the most part as children, and in possession of comparatively low types of civilization; but time, and altered circumstances, and a higher stage of civilization, clearly demand the framing of new laws, or the relaxing of the old ones, for the guidance of those who live in the modern world. If there is such a thing as natural development and social and religious evolution, this must needs be. Is it not irrational to suppose that the Laws of Manu—a Code compiled, according to the latest computation, 1400 years ago*—with its minute and childish formalities, its fanciful, unequal and retaliatory penalties, such as mark the earliest forms of criminal legislation, its uniform leniency shown to a certain class of the community, and its entire subordina-

* The most recent authority, Dr. Burnell, places its composition at about 500 A.D. Sir W. Jones assigned to it an almost fabulous antiquity.

tion of women, should be fitted to regulate society in the nineteenth century? Though there is much that is majestic, benevolent and beautiful about the Code, are there many among those who have become accustomed to more humane and juster laws who would like to live under it in the present day?

The conservative Hindu, however, clings to antiquity, and in the matter of child-marriage, those who protest against it *have* antiquity on their side. Rāma married Sītā; Kṛishṇa married Rukminī; Arjuna married Draupadī; Nala married Damayantī, not as children, but as grown-up women. And as for the Hindu religious books themselves, a careful study of them seems to show that infant-marriages "form no part of a religious institution in India." The very mantras that the Smṛitis prescribe to be chanted during the marriage ceremonies, clearly indicate that the bride should be a woman, and not an infant.

(*b.*) The second religious basis of child-marriage is the doctrine of the S'rāddha, or the ceremonies that follow the funeral rites. Orthodox Hindus believe that if they do not leave sons behind them, who will offer food for their souls after death, they cannot reach heaven; if they can secure this, they may rest satisfied.* Whatever may be true of the ancient Rishis and Rajahs, who died unśrāddhaed in the jungles, the ordinary disembodied spirit depends for re-embodiment and for its ascension to the region of bliss, on the regularity with which these ceremonies are solemnised by the survivors of the deceased. And it is only natural to desire that these sons, on whom so much depends, should be procured as soon as possible. A man may die, or a troop of useless daughters may appear, before the needed son arrives!

Now this is a striking example of the way in which evil practices

---

* In such ancient writings as the Aitareya-brāhmana of the Rig-veda occurs the line, in the Story of Sunahsepa:—"A father by his son clears off a debt"; *i. e.*, a man is in debt to his ancestors till he has a son, because the dead depend for happiness on the ceremonies performed by sons. In the first four chapters of the 4th Book of the Grihya (domestic) Sutras of the Rig-veda, the funeral rites and Śrāddha ceremonies are prescribed. A fuller description is given by Manu (iii. 123-286) and in ix. 138, he says:—"Since the son delivers his father from the hell named *put*, he was therefore called *put-tra* by Brahma himself." This is doubtless at the root of the desire of the Hindu for the birth of a son rather than a daughter. The Śrāddha ceremony is also the key to the Hindu law of inheritance. It affords the chief evidence of kinship, and gives the title to participation in the patrimony. "The *Gotra* or family," says Monier Williams, (and see Manu V. 60,) is in fact a corporate body bound together by what may be called *Sapindaship* and *Samanodakaship*. All who offer the funeral cake (*pinda*) and water (*udaka*) together are Sapindas and Samanodakas to each other, and a kind of intercommunion and interdependence is thus continually maintained between the dead and living members of a family—between past, present, and future generations." (*Indian Wisdom*, p. 254.—2nd Ed.)

may be nurtured by religious belief; how, under the influence of superstitious teaching, people will outrage the laws of their nature, and the highest interests of social and national life. And this is after all the most serious charge that can be brought against Hinduism—degenerate, idolatrous, and popular Hinduism, in distinction from pre-Buddhistic Brahmanism—*viz.*, the evil customs that it has fostered or created. Child-marriage, Hindu widowhood with all its woes, satī, the ignorance and degradation of women, polygamy, caste, these have all grown up—a wild and poisonous overgrowth—under the withering shade of modern Hinduism. We do not deny the deep religious faith of ancient India; but what can be said when all the evil customs that Hindus now deplore, are intertwined with the creed and laws under which they have lived and been bound for centuries? Has this been a condition of life or of death?

But the majority of those who read these pages no longer entertain those beliefs that have been the fruitful source of these pernicious customs; they do not believe that balls of rice and flour can have any effect on departed spirits; that any ceremonies or sacred places can accelerate the progress of disembodied relatives to heaven.* They might well ask, with their Cārvāka materialistic and satirical poet :—

> "If offerings of food can satisfy
> Hungry departed spirits, why supply
> The man who goes a journey, with provisions?
> His friends at home can feed him with oblations."†

Nor would such readers urge, in defence of child-marriage, what has been called the 'population' reason; that no birth to the world should be lost; and that, therefore, child-bearing should begin as early as it can. If a nation believes in the transmigration of souls through a succession of bodies—that souls are awaiting their re-births in this world—there will be a religious desire to provide the necessary bodies. But this highly disinterested reason does not operate, we imagine, to a very great degree; while the practice of

---

* We have never seen a reconciliation of the doctrine of the Śrāddha with the doctrine of transmigration. If every soul must bear the consequences of the good or evil forces set in motion by the soul itself, how can any Śrāddha ceremonies arrest the ripening of acts (karma-vipāka,) or what right have we to try to interfere with the processes of justice? And does not such teaching encourage religious indolence? If a man can only have sons to help his spirit onwards after death, he may trust to such means rather than put forth personal effort after a holy life. He may get to heaven by proxy.

† Quoted in *Indian Wisdom*, p. 133-2nd Ed.

child-marriage turns out practically, to be a loss and not a gain to the world; for mortality among child-wives and their feeble offspring is very high. And we may well ask, is the mere propagation of the species the only or the highest end of marriage? Its highest end is mutual helpfulness, arising out of mental and spiritual affinities.

We pass on in the second place to consider the *moral* reasons for child-marriage. The best that can be said in defence of the practice is based on the very questionable maxim—let us do evil that good may come.

(*a.*) It is said to be in the interests of morality; though why these interests should not have equal weight in the case of child-widows, it is not easy to see. Parents marry their girls when they arrive at puberty in order that they may not be led astray from virtue. But does not this unseemly haste to get daughters married, while being professedly respect paid to morality, form a serious indictment against the morals of the country? Are the relations of the sexes such, then, that girls cannot be trusted; that virtue becomes impossible after a certain age? Contrast this state of things with the pure homes of England, where thousands of unmarried girls grow up and attain to womanhood, beautiful for their private and public virtues. We have often wondered why Hindus do not break through this evil custom from very shame. It may certainly be a preventive of immorality, but the need of such prevention can only be the mark and the effect of a low state of civilization and morality. Were the people generally more pure and chaste, this reason, which in itself we must commend, would fall to the ground. Child-marriage proclaims with the loudest voice that the moral tone of India needs to be improved. Hindus themselves have become so accustomed to the present state of things that they little know the revelation it makes to others of their national weakness, and of their need of social and moral regeneration.

(*b.*) But, further, it is urged in the interests of morality, and also of nature, that as soon as a girl shows the sign of womanhood, the time has come for her to marry, and to become a mother. But this is to observe one sign of nature, and to overlook the others. A girl may be capable of marriage, but it does not follow—for reasons which it is unnecessary here to state—that she is physiologically fit. The physical frame-work is not built up; the proper development of the individual is not completed for some years after; and till then, the assumption of the state of motherhood is unnatural and injurious

in the extreme. One of the ancient Rishis—Vashistha—says it is a shame for a father to allow an unmarried daughter to attain puberty in his house. But he says nothing about *age*. In olden time, as we have seen, some men married women, not children; and all girls, in all probability, married later. For it is early marriage that unnaturally forces nature. It is the evil practice that itself provides the reason for the practice. If Hindus began to marry their girls later, they would find their reason for marrying them appearing later too. Maturity would probably be postponed for two or three years at least.

But this reason that is alleged for marriage has another important bearing. If the coming of age is a shame and a wrong in a child unmarried, it is a shame and a wrong afterwards; and this physiological doctrine, if honestly carried out, should lead, as Surgeon-General Balfour has pointed out, to the re-marriage of every virgin *widow*! If the coming of age is a reason for marrying children, it is surely still more a reason for the marriage of young widows.

(*c.*) Among the reasons for the practice, *climate*, it is said, requires early marriage. We will simply quote on this point the opinion of two native doctors of India. Dr. Goodeve Chuckerbutty of Bengal says:—"I am not aware that there is any practical difference between Native Christian girls and European girls as to the time of their attaining age. The Hindu and Muhammadan girls, from the custom of early marriage, attain a forced development at an earlier age." And Dr. Atmaram Pandurang of Bombay says:—"The custom of premature marriage, thereby acting injuriously upon the morals of the people among whom it prevails, has an undoubted tendency to bring on early puberty, and this is strangely mistaken for climate influence. Climate has no influence in the matter."

(*d.*) There is yet another reason, unquestionably the most obstinate of all, and which constitutes the real difficulty in the way of progress; *custom* requires it; and it is inconvenient and often dangerous to go against custom. Mrs. Grundy is the tyrant of modern society. "What will Mrs. Grundy say?" "What will Mrs. Grundy think?" "What will our compeers and caste associates say?"

"Custom forms us all;
Our thoughts, our morals, our most fixed belief,
Are consequences of our place of birth."

But

"Custom does often reason overrule,
And only serves for reason to the fool."

Custom, which is now doubtless the great match-maker of India, is

the great despot and bugbear of Indian social life, and yet, according to Hindu authorities, the law of custom is one of the last authorities in rank, far below śrutis, sūtras, smṛitis, and purāṇas. We have no need to slander the past, nor to speak irreverently of our ancestors. There is always in every country a certain amount of conservatism which the reformer should be prepared to deal with tenderly. Ancient institutions and observances need not be dishonoured; and the difficulty of breaking through immemorial customs is acknowledged to be immense; yet it yields gradually to the superior claims of intelligence and justice. For there is something higher, more powerful, more absolute than custom, and that is the reason and conscience of enlightened men. Where custom and reason clash, it is clear which must give way. When customs become antiquated, and are seen to be injurious to the public good, and plainly unsuited to the age, they claim, as do all the dead, a respectful burial, or cremation. The chief opponents are of course the priests—the great conservators of Hindu customs and superstitions. It is their own interest to be such; and since they are usually sharers in the gains of a marriage, no wonder that a man has no peace till his daughter is disposed of, and that he is often threatened with the terrors of gods and demons, of ghosts and men! But free and thinking minds are not to be kept down for ever by unscrupulous priestcraft. No custom, whether approved by priest or king, should be enforced or followed, if it is opposed to health and reason, morality and justice.

And this has been felt and acted on by certain classes of the people. Native Christians and members of the Brahma Samāj have consented in this matter to go against custom. The law has made early marriages for them illegal; and they are prepared to abide by it. If they can go against custom, and put up with inconvenience, why not others? Many members of the orthodox Hindu community have also set their face against it, and are prepared for a new departure. Why should it be disliked and shunned because it is a new departure? If it had not been for its new departures, its fresh developments, which have meant new leases of life and progress, this old world of ours would long ago have been a huge Egyptian mummy, dried and swaddled in its own mouldering grave-clothes. If India is to advance; if she is to take her place among the civilized and progressive nations of the world, her best sons must throw off their lethargy, and deal courageously with these social problems. As long as she advocates child-marriage, India must

be content with a place among the child races of mankind. Child-marriage and Indian widowhood are unworthy of the intelligence and traditions of Hindus. At present they are the dark blot on the national polity, which contrasts so strikingly with the civilized society of the West.

T. E. Slater.

FIRST PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION.

Among the many theories advanced to account for the cause of the evils that are weighing down the people of India in the depths of poverty, and the many cures suggested none could be more partial and incomplete than the Rationalistic. This theory has found a recent advocate in a prominent writer whom, for convenience and explicitness we shall consider the exponent of this school.

We agree with him in the main as to the existing state of affairs, but fail to see that he has either apprehended the cause, or prophesied the cure. A physician may with facility diagnose his case and pronounce the disease, but when he comes to detect the cause and prescribe the cure, failure in the former, renders the latter either fortuitous or ineffectual.

Among the evils enumerated as constituting this pressure on India the author mentions poverty, mental and bodily slavery, caste and fatalism. I accept his enumeration with one exception —an exception however which mars his whole theory, as we shall see in the sequel. That exception is caste, which I regard on good authority, to be itself the cause of all the others and therefore not a proximate, but the antecedent cause of the present physical, moral and intellectual stagnation of India. As long as caste rules are the dominant principles of daily life and caste observances the highest touchstone of moral obligation, it is hopeless to attempt to break the spell of ignorance or snap the chains of poverty. This is the hydra-headed monster—darting its remorseless tooth, now at Education, now at social economy, now at Religion—against which the Bellerophon of England, our National Government, must hurl his darts. This the chimera against which reforms must be launched. Here is the secret in two brief lines from the Bhagavad Gita

> "Perfection is alone attained by him
> Who swerves not from the business of his caste."

This is the sublime fatalism, the fatal poison which the monster

ever blurts out—fatalism in daily occupation, confining a family for generations to the trade of an ancestor; thus setting a premium on indolence and extinguishing the light of genius—fatalism in domestic and social affairs, producing ignorance and disunion.—fatalism in morality, leading to open vice and the deification of the obscene.

For this awful disease which is gnawing the vitals of civilization in India, two causes are assigned. First, the stupendous ignorance of the people; second, the climate of the country and the fertility of the soil.

The second he calls natural and therefore unalterable and in this we agree. The principle is well attested that if the environment of any animal, man included, be such that food and safety are easily obtained, it tends to produce rapid and permanent degeneration. This principle or law of parasitism is everywhere recognized by science and can be readily endorsed by experience. All nations who have passed away, buried in tombs hewn by their own effeminacy; all individuals cursed with the product of fortune, inheritance, or speculation; inmates of the poorhouse and hangers on of Government; are monuments to the unalterable retribution of this law.

But our Author is not so felicitous in his first and paramount reason for the present existing condition. He has given us a physical cause, namely, the climate and fertility of the soil. He has added a cause as existing in the mental condition of the people, namely, their stupendous ignorance. But here he stops, ignoring entirely the most important feature in the solution of this great national problem. True he refers to this casually in his discussion, but gives it no vital place—in which he reminds us of a man attempting to criticise Gladstone's career in a sentence, or refute Kant's critique in a foot note. We therefore attribute India's low civilization to her threefold serfdom; Physical, Intellectual, and Moral, and lay the blame on caste which has dogmatized over all three spheres.

The next point he considers is, how to remove this great restraint on civilization which ignorance has placed, and he replies, by education, which may be divided into direct, and indirect. The indirect he defines as commerce and the products of science, namely, the Telegraph, Steam, Railroads &c. The direct, he continues, has been misapplied and therefore its progress has been slow and limited, whereas, it should have been speedier and more powerful

than the indirect. It has been misapplied; first, as to its subjects, and second, as to its object.

On the first point he remarks, that education has invariably begun with the middle class, that is to say, the middle class intellectually, and if it has seemed in England to begin with those who were the middle class pecuniarily, it did so, because they were also the middle class intellectually. This is all very true—the "common herd" will not seek education but must be driven to it by force of circumstances or government enactment, and as the number of those now desirous is as great as we can well manage, let us educate these and they will be the best impulse to the lower order.

Direct education, our author says further, has been misapplied as to its object, *i.e*, in the answer given to the question—In what shall we educate the people? And here we believe he has made total shipwreck. His broad division of the field of knowledge into Moral and Intellectual is unscientific and, judging from the sequel, one would say purposely so, for it enables him to banish the first entirely, which result he seems anxious to effect.

Direct education we would define to be the art of developing and cultivating the various physical, intellectual, æsthetic and moral faculties; in other words an unfolding of man's whole nature, and should therefore consist of four branches, answering to the four faculties.

1. Under physical education, all that relates to the organs of sensation and to the muscular and nervous systems would find place.

2. Under intellectual education, the means by which the powers of the understanding are to be developed.

3. Aesthetic education would comprise the various agencies which purify and refine the mind by training it to delight in the beautiful, the true, the pure; in nature, literature and art; and to shrink from what is gross, lewd and unlovely.

4. The sphere of moral education then would be to cultivate and regulate the affections by a presentation of our moral relations which comprise moral duties, their religious sanction and the laws of economy.

These being the elements of a well rounded education as prescribed by nature, how far has our author provided for it? He rules out the first and third without a word of apology, and he attempts to rule out the fourth by a series of arguments of which an Englishman and an inheritor of the advantages of a Christian civilization

ought to be ashamed. His argument is as follows ;—Moral education ought to be ruled out of a curriculum for Indian students :—

1. Because men are divided as to its merit.

On this principle we must close our schools, shut up our churches, disband our armies, disorganize the Government, and packing our belongings, relegate the care of India to that national party, not a small minority either, who see no good in anything that savours of England. But the law of the survival of the fittest, which being scientific our author will at once admit, holds sway, and by the very opposition which he attempts to raise against this moral force, will prove its worthiness to live.

2. Because religion is invariably intruded, men's passions excited, and all hope of national agreement for ever lost.

To this we reply—that it depends entirely on your definition of religion. If it be identified with superstition, with fanaticism, or even with the sectarian forms of Christianity, this may be feared ; but if the great central truth common to all religions, namely, man's relation to God, which has ever been the chief spring in human civilization, be recognized as the religious principle, we see no danger of unbridled passion or national disturbance, and no infringement of the religious freedom, as granted by our statutes to the people of India.

3. Because teaching what morality is, will not make man moral and preaching virtue, honesty and charity is therefore a useless waste of time and energy. As well, he says, teach them how to eat, drink and sleep.

This last sentence is a fatal answer to his own argument, for where in all verity will we find a larger field than in rectifying the errors due to disregard of the laws of health in India, where unwholesome diet and slovenly habits are undermining the physical constitution of the masses and supplying annually thousands of victims to the Cholera God.

The natives, he says, know as much about morality as we do—"They imbibe it from their mothers' milk." Yes, if that milk contains it, but whence has it been assimilated by the mother ? From a literature and tradition that abounds in falsehood and superstition, that detail bloody, cruel and licentious ideas and practices ; and that are devoid of that simple, pure life which Christianity alone imparts ?

4. Because teaching them what duty is, wont make them moral. Here he says is the kernel of the whole matter—what force will

compel a man to do right? And what answer is given by this scion of the Rationalistic School?—The only force that will compel man to do right is force of intellect. Granting for the moment that his hypothesis is true, how does it affect his argument? In brief it stands as follows:—

Moral knowledge is useless, because it is wanting in an ultimate sanction. The intellect is the only true criterion; therefore omit all moral knowledge and educate the intellect in natural science. In other words invest blind reason with the power of dictatorship in the moral sphere, and without training it in the knowledge of moral distinctions, consider its deliverance infallible.

The History of India then would not be without a parallel, for the France of a century ago tried the same policy, and it would not be long before the statesmen at the helm in India would cry out as the noble Frenchman did, "If there be no God we must invent one."

Our author seems to be one like him whom Wordsworth describes in the lines:—

> "One to whose smooth rubbed soul can cling
> Nor form, nor feeling great or small;
> A reasoning, selfsufficient thing
> An intellectual all-in-all."

We believe that intellectual and moral science are so related that neither can adequately interpret its own facts without the aid of the other, and, that to maintain a proper balance between the two is the true aim of Education.

But what after all is this intellectual knowledge which the author advocates? Intellectual knowledge, he says, is of two kinds, the one artificial the other natural; the former, embracing History, Geography, and General literature or books of art: the latter being confined to the sciences and mechanical arts. The accuracy of this division is of course dependent on the answer we give to the question—what is the object of study? The almost universal answer to which would be, first, to develope the powers, and second, to store the mind with useful facts. But our author fails to appreciate the fact that Education is an object in itself, to be sought irrespective of effect on the increase of bread stuffs or the satisfaction of fleshly craving. Man is not a mere machine, made to keep in action by some foreign force, so constituted as to perform a fixed amount of work and then fall to pieces at death. He is a being of free spiritual powers and consequent responsibilities.

We have little hope of that system of education which fails to give these powers perpetual impulse and expansion. Our author seems to think that all that is necessary, is to fit men for various trades. Is this the *summum bonum* of culture, or does not the ground of man's education rest rather in his nature than his calling? He must be educated because he is a man; not because he is to plant potatoes, make nails, or weave cloth. Is trade the end of of man's being? Can his mind be shut up to this? Can his thought be exhausted by it? Surely not. He has faculties it cannot exercise and wants it cannot satisfy. Poems and systems of philosophy, great thoughts that have swayed millions and electrified the world, have been wrought out at the work bench, and History pronounces Science herself debtor to the plough. Undoubtedly we say, let a man perfect his trade, for thus he earns his bread and serves the community. But the scripture word of Him who "Spake as never man spake" is still true "Man does not live by bread alone" for if he did his lot would be harder than that of "The beasts that perish" for whom nature sows, reaps, and weaves, thus providing them with necessaries without toil or care.

Nor was man made merely to gratify the desires of a community. As a rational, moral Being, he is an end in himself and his mind with wisdom, disinterestedness, firmness of purpose, and piety, is worth more than the material interests of a world. He belongs to a home, a country, a church, a race and to limit his culture to fitness for a trade, is not only the merest ignorance but the most grievous sin.

We are well aware that this is not the popular view in the present day, and that such a disinterested desire for the production of a superior race has seldom entered into schemes of national policy. Invention and effort are engaged more on matter than mind and in consequence, the earth is burdened with pyramids and palaces, while the greater work of building up a nobler intellect and character, seldom occurs to the most adventurous statesman.

Such a policy would, if adopted, be retroactive, and in the end redound to the advantage of material interests. There is a harmony between the physical and the mental, which we often lose sight of. As the mind naturally expresses itself in material forms, so its increased capacity will be felt in the physical sphere. Holland redeemed from the Ocean by her system of dikes; Venice the island City; the wildernesses and rock-bound hills of Europe converted into smiling fields and fruitful vineyards, point to mind as

the great source of physical good and prove that in making the culture of man our highest aim, we will not retard but advance the civilization of nature.

But to substantiate his theory, our author makes a final appeal to History, to prove that in proportion to the increase and diffusion of natural knowledge has been the rate of advance in civilization. Strange that he should appeal to History at all after anathematizing it as he did, and pronouncing sentence of excommunication from the curriculum of studies for India. But a man may be inconsistent in theory and consistent in practice, as our author here proves himself to be. If his historical education had been neglected, he could make no appeal and have no past to guide him. But perhaps he does not owe so much to history after all; one would think so from his perversion of historical facts; nor to morality either, seeing he perverts them with such facility. He shall speak for himself.

"If we watch the progress of nations we find that in proportion to the increase and diffusion of natural knowledge, has been their rate of advance in civilization. What we have termed artificial knowledge has had little or nothing to do with this advance. Science *alone* has caused the difference. The Phœnicians and Egyptians and the Greeks were the first peoples who cultivated science with any degree of success, and they were the first to arrive at any degree of civilization."

But science was neglected and deterioration set in—then came the middle ages with savage wars—and only when science awoke from her long sleep, were men's eyes opened and a new era set in. Scientific knowledge was revived and behold the transformation! In short, says our author, the result is ourselves. "The present civilized Englishman is the latest and grandest achievement of Science."

Without attempting a separate reply to each statement in the series by which the author attempts to bolster up his position, we will place against the whole what we believe to be the true interpretation of the historical development which has produced the civilized Englishman of to-day, and which makes him to differ from his ancestor of a century ago, and that ancestor to differ from Odin and his blood drinking Berserks.

We hold with Huet, whose "Le Régne Social du Christianisme" the author might peruse with profit, that the immortal germ of society from which our rights and duties may be deduced and in which, the moral, political and economic truths that distinguish our age are disclosed, is to be found, not in Science, but, in the Old Faith

whose ultimate aim is to prepare, in a free and brotherly society below, the nucleus of a heavenly citizenship. Freedom, Equality, Brotherhood freed from the passionate extremes of modern socialism, represent the primitive and historic spirit of Christianity; and to these ideas with that complementary doctrine of Divine Fatherhood, are due, not only the various agencies that are ameliorating the ills of life, but the existence of science herself to which they have been as guardian spirits.

Let our author and his school say, the artificial and the natural are the all, and sweeping away the former leave only science, but until they sweep away this third element, the supernatural, we will stand by the old land-marks of God, the soul, and their mutual relations, as the ultimate principles to be recognized for true progress. They are among those of whom Mrs. Browning writes :—

> " Many thinkers of this age, who understand
> Our natural world too insularly, as if
> No spiritual counterpart completed it,
> Consummating its meaning, rounding all
> To justice and perfection . . . . .
> The great below clenched by the great above."

The question therefore to the answering of which we set ourselves finally is,—What is the main force to which 19th century civilization is due ? And we unhesitatingly affirm—Christianity, which has ever been the great civilizing force in human History.

In this part of our discussion we shall take civilization in its broad sense, including all that makes for individual and social improvement—the inventions and discoveries that lighten the burden of labour and increase material comfort ; the safeguards of law, refined sentiments, literature, art, and science ; the amenities of social intercourse ; in short, all that raises man above the rude barbarian. We would not call that state civilized where these privileges and benefits are enjoyed by a select class while the masses are degraded to a state akin to serfdom. Nor is that a civilized state where the fine arts flourish, while agriculture and the mechanical arts languish. Civilization must not only include all these, but include them so as to secure impartial development of man's powers and a fair distribution of social advantages, and must carry with it also the germ of indefinite progress.

Christianity we do not identify with the church, her peculiar vehicle, for the church herself has often been the victim of superstition, torn by dissension or belied by fanaticism. Not with the

church, for she has often been arrayed against intellect, leagued with oppression, fettering inquiry and encouraging encroachments on free and enlightened thinking. The Christianity we hold to be the foster mother of civilization is that broad all-embracing power that recognizes the great quickening truths of human brotherhood and Divine Fatherhood which, however obscured and paralyzed by the many errors which ignorance or fraud have linked to it, has ever been the mainspring of civilization and the hope of humanity. It is this new moral force which appeared in human history during the Roman ascendency, embodied in the life and teachings of Jesus the Christ, attested by His unexampled purity and devotion, and the truths of which were so profound and universal that the whole has formed a new power in the world. We propose to consider what its influence has been on the advancement of our race in humanity and morality, and what its nature and objects lead us to infer it will accomplish, in proportion as its principles become recognized and disseminated.

We will not deny that many other influences, material, moral and intellectual, have thrown in their lot with this new moral force, but, though it is a difficult, it is not an impossible undertaking, to estimate the relative power of each.

The terms being thus defined, we would present our argument under two heads :—

1. The principles of Christianity favourable to a high civilization.
2. The historical argument or what these principles have accomplished.

First as to the principles of Christianity which promote a high civilization :—

(*a*). Christianity recognizes the responsibility and respects the rights of the individual.

The progress of civilization is marked by a growing respect for individual rights and the ampler room given for their realization and extension. The huge despotisms of Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia and Persia, as a step in advance of the primitive state, when every man's hand was against his neighbour; present an imposing spectacle, and yet, as compared with these, the little cities of Greece, with their freer political life, were immeasurably grander.

But even this supplanting of naked force by a state asçendency had to bow before the new moral force of Christianity, which did not usurp the state function, but limited and sanctioned it by teaching allegiance to a higher Kingdom. And if this did supply the ground

on which the church erected a Theocracy, the reformation gave back to the individual, what he had been deprived of by all three, his proper autonomy. Self respect, intellectual activity, and a development of science and inventive genius, are the legitimate fruit of this progressive movement.

(*b*) Christianity favours universal education. Mental culture is a necessary corollary to the doctrine of individual responsibility, and, the common school system, and the free circulation of the Bible, are testimony to the fact, that Christianity has not only pointed out the need, but supplied it. Neither civil tyranny, nor ecclesiastical enactment, could thwart its progress toward securing and maintaining liberty of conscience and freedom of speech.

(*c*) Christianity discountenances ascetecism.

Its mission is not to make a nation of recluses, but to mingle its leaven with the mass of humanity in their earthly pursuits, as a renovating purifying influence. The elevation of family life, the imparting of a new impulse to art, science, trade and even amusement, are among its bequests. Ascetecism, with its ghostly realm of devotees, would interpose a gulf between religion and business, but Christianity's mission is to bridge the gulf between things natural and supernatural, and show their vital interdependence.

(*d*) Christianity fosters a spirit of progress.

Without her guardianship, there may be a degree of superinduced civilization, as in China, but a civilization which expands through forces inherent in itself, there cannot be. Such a development as that of China, though fair to view, is abnormal and either remains stationary or becomes degenerate. The civilization of the Roman Empire too, was of this nature and clearly proves the law of decadence through inherent weakness. The spirit of progress, the unexhausted energy and hopefulness, the rapid march of material and intellectual achievement among Christian nations, is not due to characteristics of race or climate alone, but to their religion.

(*e*) Christianity fosters humane ideas.

By force of her example and teachings; regard for the weak, the poor, the unfortunate; humanity to the prisoner and the brute; opposition to slavery, oppression and cruelty; respect for woman and the sacredness of marriage; co-operation of capital and labour and a more equable distribution of wealth; international trade and commerce, and the supplanting of war by international arbitration; are becoming world wide, and have already proved, in Europe and America, an approach to the ideal state.

2. But our second appeal is to historical fact or what these principles have accomplished. For convenience and brevity, we will adopt the chronological order, rather than take up each new movement and trace it from its incipiency to its establishment.

(*a*) The Roman period.

During the Roman period, when the Legion found foothold on every soil, when Roman law was the code of all nations, and the great Empire of the Tiber controlled the civilized world; what did the new moral force, radiating from the cradle at Bethlehem, accomplish?

Nor will we deprive of well earned praise in this period that noble system of philosophy and morals inculcated by the frequenters of the Stoa and followers of Zeno. Stoicism was the highest philosophical and moral development of Greek and Roman antiquity, and acted as a faithful handmaid to the new power, when it first appeared in the person of the Nazarene. But there were certain features of progress which were the direct result of the new movement, and to these our attention will be confined. Among these we find a true theory of the Parental relation, in contrast to the tyranny of the "Patria potestas"; the checking of licentious and cruel sports; befriending of the slave and serf; the social equality of the sexes and the purity and binding character of the marriage tie; the adjustment of the rights of property; and the equalization of human conditions by charity.

We briefly notice the two last mentioned. As to the question of distribution of wealth, the new faith uttered no uncertain sound, and all progress toward an equal adjustment of the rights of property is but the reflection of that tendency to humble wealth, and to exalt poverty, which was so manifest an element of His teaching.

Identifying Himself with the working class by occupation and sympathy, he also warned the rich to scatter their acquisitions, so that neither the indolence of modern socialism, nor the weakness of modern pauperism, nor lust for gain, found escape from His rebuke, while the true reward of industry, with relief for the unfortunate, were ever inculcated. The world never needed a doctrine of charity more than in that period just following the Messiah's advent. The Despot had stripped some of the fairest provinces of the ancient world, to feed the extravagance and display of the Imperial Court and City. A certain dutiful almsgiving to beggars was certainly recognized, but the sentiment and conviction, born of Christianity, of the obligation on every man to wisely relieve human misery, was not known. Notwithstanding the systems of "Out door relief"

under the Roman Augustus, or the "Mutual assistance societies" of Greece under Trajan, or the later "Collegia", it remained for Christianity to initiate the organized charities, perfected in the modern period, which have wiped so many tears and saved so many lives from misery and sin.

(*b.*) The middle ages.

In considering the effect of Christianity on the half civilized and barbarian elements of European Society in the middle ages, we must keep in mind the fundamental principle on which it works in achieving its results.

Its victories, unlike those of a General in the army, are not limited by time and place, but are rather of a silent nature, won in the individual heart and life. Occasionally, we see a definite measurable step in human progress, but the rule is, first individual minds become imbued with its principles and are personally transformed by them, then the influence extends until abuses are rooted out and injustice melts away. Of many evils in the middle ages and the modern period, it is difficult to say when they came to an end. They disappeared before the new spirit in the world.

The first and most evident effect of Christianity on this semi-barbarous age, was the new position it gave to woman and the sacred value it attached to marriage. As time rolls on, the test of civilization in every clime, is the social, legal, and political position of the weaker sex. The tendency of Christianity has ever been to make her in all appropriate things man's equal, to enlist her influence in every department of life and even to surround her with a certain sacredness. Toward this end the new force undoubtedly gained much stimulus from German habits of thought.

But Christianity purified her morals, pledged her to labours of humanity when single, and to the sacred duties of wife and mother when married. It changed the low idea of marriage common among German tribes and by protecting her rights and encouraging her dowry, placed family life, even in these disturbed centuries, on a purified basis from which has been educed whatever of good now exists in European social life.

But the new force went beyond the sphere of womanhood in its reforms. It curbed the barbaric thirst for blood-revenge, so that legal satisfaction took the place of feuds and law supplanted violence. It saved the state from anarchy, when private war threatened to usurp the rights of public justice.

We read with horror of plundered peasants, desolated towns, wasted

fields, weeping widows and orphans, under the curse of unrestrained feudalism; and then a figure serene appears upon the troubled waters and calms the waves of strife. The most materialistic of sceptics, reading that page in human history, must feel grateful that even the so called "myth" of an "Agnus Dei" could control, even for a moment, the passionate hate and blood thirst of men.

But we can only mention some of the further steps in the progress of Christian influence in the middle ages, such as the restraining of those rude methods of obtaining truth and justice, "The Ordeal," "The Wager of Battle," "The Judicial Duel," and "The System of Torture." This latter abuse, supported by Roman law, untouched by Stoicism, countenanced by a corrupt Church, was crushed out by this law of love which also at a later date hurled to the earth that other great demon, the Inquisition.

(*c.*) The modern period.

We have spoken of the circumstances which militate against an accurate detail of the achievements of Christianity in the two previous periods. In the modern period, however, we enter upon firmer ground. We are nearer the actors and events, and therefore can speak of what was begun by our own people and, in part, under our own eyes.

Attribute what weight we may to the legacy transmitted from the nations of antiquity, or to the peculiar genius of their barbarian conquerors, every candid enquirer must acknowledge Christianity to have been the main force in moulding the European nations now on the field of action. Indeed the line of her achievements is so long that only a brief glance is possible, and we must content ourselves with pointing out principles, rather than exhibiting the growth of their application.

The position of woman, that index finger of civilization among the leading Christian races, is above and beyond anything hitherto known. Christianity's advocacy of chaste single marriage, to which Lucretius attributed the first true refinement of our race; her limitation of divorce to one sin and that destroying the root of the marriage relation; her condemnation of prostitution for hire, or, as in India, the sacrifice of virtue and purity at the shrine of a Deity, are some of the ways in which she has affected woman's position. What is the result? She is educating the youth in the home, the school, the academy, and even in the College. She is practising medicine, superintending Hospitals and Asylums, and being trained for all this, in Colleges built for her and over which she is becoming

more and more the presiding officer. She is managing the great system of organized charities, which is pre-eminently the characteristic of our modern period, and in the inauguration of which she was the moving spirit.

How much misfortune has she thus prevented or relieved, how many public abuses reformed and how much vice suppressed? The "American Civil War" and the "Franco-German War" too, are monuments of her untiring energy and discreet zeal in modifying the terrible evils which her own countrymen and the enemy suffered through this still existing scourge.

Nor is Woman's influence less powerful in social and private life. In the home she directs the secular and religious education of her children and exerts a moral force over her husband. Among the lower classes, intemperance has been checked, economy fostered, child life elevated. Among the middle class, she has urged the moral side of all questions, promoted honesty in the payment of debts, supported the best movements in charity and religion, and given her children, often at the expense of her own ease and comfort, a higher education. Among the fortunate classes, amid much frivolity and display, she still keeps family life pure and leads her husband in humane effort toward her less fortunate sisters. The struggle for her rights has been a long and vexed one, but the issue has never been doubtful, for she had a worthy Champion and to Him and His religion the world owes all she has accomplished toward our present civilization.

The indirect influence of Christianity on International war, on the treatment of war prisoners, the explosion of the theory that two nations being at war, every citizen of each was *ipso facto* at war with every citizen of the other, keeping of international faith and arbitration, can be gleaned from the pages of Grotius and many publicists since his day, and she has thus made a practical application of the principle "Love your enemy."

Outside of nominal Christian nations there is no international law existing. The Koran's teachings are the very opposite, and treachery toward the "Infidel" is highly commended. No Buddhist code of international law exists. Even the Chinese, with all their boasted science and art, have never thought of it. It is peculiarly the outcome of the "Gospel of peace."

Slavery, serfdom and even the duel have faded before the new light, and prison and charity reforms are part of the new order. All the asylums, hospitals, reformatories and homes for the lame, the

blind, the deaf idiot and the insane, the widow, the orphan and the aged, are blossoms of this "Tree of life," whose fruit is for the healing of the nations.

Concerning the Sabbath, that great boon of the labouring classes, a word. Under the enormous pressure of trade among modern nations and the race for wealth, there would have come a breaking down of physical power, a wearing out of brain, and a corresponding moral degeneracy, had not this day of rest been interposed for tired nature, this day of silence to the wheels of the factory and the hum of the market, the confusion of "change" and the strain of the "office." By it, men's thoughts, are called away from the perishing to the enduring, from the scene where profit and loss, as measured by the standard of trade, are the daily calculation, to the scene where treasures are above the world's barter, and the principles of righteousness are inculcated. The Lord's day has proved itself not only a paying institution, but a safeguard against intemperance and vice, so rife among the labouring classes. So indispensable indeed has it proved itself to human progress, that were the whole world to renounce its Faith in the supernatural, it must hold to this institution or the race would become extinct.

"History is philosophy teaching by examples," said Dionysius, and never was that philosophy more instructive or those examples so numerous, as in this nineteenth Christian century. As we approach its close, what change, what development, what progress, what achievement we behold! Stirring events are transpiring before us. Divine providence is writing history with a rapidity and on a scale of magnitude unparalleled in all the past. Christianity was never such a power in the world as it is to-day, despite the unbelief of our times. The Anglo Saxon race, the custodian of Christianity and therefore the race of progress and dominion, has grown from five millions to one hundred millions and is marching on to universal supremacy, and the achievements of her religion in the department of missions to many lands are on a parallel scale.

To the Christian, all the facts of history, all the truth of science, all the progress in commerce, all advance in civilization are the fulfilment of the prophecy, "He has set the bounds of the habitation of nations to the end that they might seek Him." Nothing in the world of literature to-day could be more incomplete, than a history of our times without a long thrilling chapter on Christian Missions.

In closing our investigation of this subject, we ask whether, supposing these principles which we have considered were to thoroughly

imbue society, would they produce the highest type of civilization? We have seen them achieving definite and measurable results during a certain period of time and proved them to be of such a nature as to produce indefinitely the same results in an unlimited time. In short, we have shown them to be all that evolution requires to form a perfect society.

Surely a power capable of leading all future ages in moral and humane progress is the power that will ever produce the highest civilization and that power is not science but Christianity.

T. Edward Inglis.

IRONCLADS vs. WOODEN WALLS.

The times have changed since Nelson's day;
Our wooden walls have passed away
When wrapt in fire and smoke,
Our ensign flaunted in the breeze,
And flew, as mistress of the seas,
O'er ships and hearts of oak.

Each British heart with pride recalls,
The glory of those wooden walls,
Of those who fought their guns.
Her flag brought freedom to the slave
Made England Empress of the wave,
And sea kings all her sons!

No longer now, as in the past,
The swelling canvas decks the mast,
Whilst bending to the breeze,
The frigate scuds before the wind,
And leaves the chalky cliffs behind,
To scour the foreign seas.

The wooden walls have had their day,
Now other forces come in play,
Of Iron and of Steam;
Rifled guns and mighty balls,
Iron ships and iron walls,
Whilst fires from funnels gleam.

But England here has boundless store
For iron is her native ore,
And deep in many a seam,
Lies ancient oak, which yields as coal,
What to a ship is life and soul,
And drives as steam.

Her sturdy sons are still the same;
With iron will in iron frame,
Our Empire they maintain;
Then heave no sigh for wooden wall,
No harm to England can befall.
If hearts of oak remain!

J. D. B. GRIBBLE.

LITERARY NOTICES.

Religion in History and in the Life of To-day :—by A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., Airedale College, Bradford. Hodder and Stoughton, 1885, 2nd Edition.

Dr. Fairbairn has won for himself the right to a respectful hearing in any exposition he may undertake on the subject of Religion. He has risen to a first place among our authorities on Comparative Religion; his books are the fruit of long and ripe study and uniformly receive, as they deserve, a hearty welcome from thoughtful and earnest students. This latest work from his pen is a course of six lectures which he delivered to the working men of Bradford in the spring of last year. The working men of Bradford are to be congratulated on having among them a teacher at once so profound and so simple in his treatment of such weighty matters as Dr. Fairbairn discusses with them; and Bradford may be proud of the working men who heard and appreciated these lectures which he delivered.

The lectures are not apologetic in the ordinary sense of the term; they are " an attempt to explain what Religion is, how the Bible is to be construed in relation to it, what has been its action in history and what is its bearing on the questions that most concern us to day." After a discussion at some length of the fundamental question, "What is Religion?" he takes up in order the following topics:—

The place and significance of the Old Testament in Religion.
The place and significance of the New Testament in Religion.
The Christian Religion in the first fifteen centuries of its existence.
The Christian Religion in Modern Europe.
The Christian Religion in relation to our Political, Social, and Industrial questions.

The review of this somewhat extensive field Dr. Fairbairn accomplishes within the limit of a short book of less than 200 pages small octavo. That it is admirably done goes without saying. There is no skimming, or 'sketchy' work; every page bears the marks of the laborious student. It is lucid throughout and occasionally rises into passages of genuine eloquence and power.

With such a work before him the critic's occupation is gone; we shall therefore content ourselves with presenting to our readers a general outline of its scope and argument.

The book, as we have said, opens with a discussion of the question, "What is Religion?" and at the outset a distinction is enforced between the Church and Religion. These are not synonymous, as some appear to think, who in consequence "set down all the good religion has done to the churches," or "set down all the evil the churches have done to religion." We ought, rather, to look at the churches through religion and not at religion through the churches. "They exist for it; it does not exist for them; they are to be judged as they are faithful to it. They are good as they realize it, bad as they fail in realization."

Religion, he proceeds to show, is natural to man, and that "man at his best, man at his noblest, has been so, through the action and by the help of religious ideas." Historic proof of this position is given. It is found unanimous in Greece, in India, in China—in their literature, their art and their politics. The further question thus naturally rises; why is it that these religious ideas everywhere come to be, and that man is uniformly at his best when most religious? "He only who is able to enter into the meaning of that why and get a reason, has come within glimpse of understanding the question—what is religion? What religion is, depends in great part upon why it is." Thus, coming still nearer the problem, he then cites answers which various philosophers have given to the question. These he divides into three groups,—those who have held that religion is a matter of the intellect—those who affirm it to have its source in feeling—and those who say it lies in conscience or the sense of duty. Each theory is briefly criticised and dismissed as inadequate; for "religion is thought; it is feeling; it is action. It is not one of these. Yet it is all these and something more . . . . on the side of the person it is his thought of the cause or order or highest law under which he stands and the way in which he feels and acts towards him or it." This wide definition is purposely made large enough to comprehend all forms of religious expression with which we may meet.

Yet it is only a notion of religion on one side of it, the subjective; it has an objective side also. Looking at it on this side the following canon is to be applied:—"that the character of its highest conception determines its nature and quality . . . . . As the deity is, the

faith, that is built on him must be." In other words, God is the great determinative idea in religion. Religion, however, "must always be realized through man—man free, rational, intelligent. Man stands open to God, God speaks through man." Further, it is realized through man for the purposes of God. The conclusion to which the discussion brings us is that "religion has become no simple way of only saving men; it saves them—but for God's ends, not merely their own. It is no method simply for giving peace in death, or a happy immortality; it accomplishes that by making time happy, and a happy society. Religion is that eternal justice, eternal holiness, eternal purity, eternal harmony, eternal love may everywhere through man, be made to reign among men. Religion is that the purpose of God through all the ages may by men be more perfectly fulfilled."

The writer next considers in two lectures the respective places which the religion of the Old Testament and of the New hold among the religions of the world. The principles obtained in the previous lecture are here applied, so that the enquiry is chiefly concerning the idea of God which the scriptures set forth, and the degree in which the religion embodied in them was realised by the Jews—and this as compared with the religious and national life of contemporary nations. There is abundance of quotable matter here which we cannot, however, give to our readers.

The fundamental idea of the lecture on the Old Testament religion is this:—"the religion of Israel was an altogether new order of religion, and it was this by virtue of its conception or thought of God and his law. By means of these it laid the basis for a new notion of man, a new type of society, a new structure or order of humanity . . . . . The change that has made our idea of man and society so unlike the ancient, is a change that begins with the law and the notion of God that came through Moses."

Comparing it with the New Testament, the author finds that, "what Israel tried to do for a people, the New Testament came to do for mankind."

Perhaps Dr. Fairbairn is at his best in his third lecture where he treats of the New Testament idea of Religion, which as he rightly shows is only attained through Christ—is in fact Christ's ideal of religion. Take one example, in connection with the Christian notion of the relation of God and man. He is speaking of that sternest fact of human experience, a guilty conscience, and has shown that "the man who is not saved from it becomes its victim, it depraves him and darkens all his world"—that even the most cultured peoples could not conceive of God saving them, pitying and helping them, and helping them the more for their consciousness of sin. "Instead they had to win his favour, win it by pain, by suffering, by surrendering to what they most

hated, the object they most loved . . . . But now see how strangely and beautifully changed and dissimilar the Christian notion is. Here God does not demand the sacrifice, He makes it; He does not extort blood, does not delight in suffering and death; He gives and giving is a passion in Him. He so loves the world that He gives for its life His only-begotten son. The great sacrifice is one not demanded from man, it is given of God; His is the act and His, too, the design to bring man home, to win the prodigal, who is still a son, from his misery, and shame and sin, to the light and life and love of the Father's house. Under Moses, God gave the law, and the law came with its severity, the dread threatening that every sin had its appropriate penalty. But under Christ God gives his love, that He may the more completely win man's. The idea was a development when viewed in relation to the Old Testament religion; but it is a contrast, nay a contradiction, to all other religions man has ever professed."

A little further on the following suggestive passage occurs under the head of Christ's method of realizing the ideal of humanity:—

"Men in the face of sin may be divided into various classes. There is the Cynic; he is a common person in these days; our clubs make him; they are great factors of cynicism. Where amid much comfort you can talk scandal, indulge wit, and derive comfort from the scorn in which you hold weaker men—it is easy and natural to be a cynic. The cynic . . . . says, 'What a poor thing is man! A compound of meanness and vanity, and whether his meanness or his vanity be most to be despised, it is hard to tell, yet were it not for this compound, what should we have to laugh at, what to make life pleasant?' . . . . . Then there is the Epicurean, the man who loves pleasure who hates alike the thought and the experience of pain. To be burdened with a sense of man's misery, is but to have his own pleasure marred, and so, he says: 'Why trouble ourselves about a state we cannot mend; man will be foolish; let him be a fool, while we here can at least make our own lives pleasant, lessen the pain of humanity by adding to our own happiness.'

Then there is the Stoic, who says:—'Virtue is beautiful, the man who is not virtuous is a creature to be pitied; he belongs to the lowest type of men. But our virtue is our own, let us cultivate virtue, and so, by showing its beauty, make it attractive, only let our calm never be broken by the restless passion that would suffer for the evil. The weaker must always be, but to the stronger they ought only to be conditions for the exercise of calmer strength.' . . . . . . But observe Christ's peculiarity; He stood alone and His religion stands alone here—He was a Redeemer, His religion is a religion of redemption. It sees sin, and it hates sin, but to it every sinner is a man that may be saved. To save him Christ lived and died . . . . The passion of Christ is the symbol of His religion, it suffers everywhere for the sin of humanity, but in order to the deliverance of the humanity that has sinned."

The next lecture—the fourth—is a study of the action of the religion of Christ in the first fifteen centuries of its existence. At the outset the author premises that his task is not to write the history of a church—

that were comparatively easy—but to describe the history of a religion—how the religion of Christ "has acted in history, how it has affected the happiness, the progress, the well-being of society and of man."

In doing so he looks at that religion from three points of view, *viz* :—i. As regards its distinctive qualities when it first appeared in the world. ii. As regards the way in which it was affected by certain old Pagan and Judaic ideas, and iii. As regards the way in which, in spite of these, the Christian truths so worked through the Christian societies as to affect for good the common life of man, our industrial and economical systems, and our toiling men and multitudes.

He then discusses Christianity in Modern Europe, as it has affected "the political, the social, the economical questions; or rather the great principles that lie as the common basis underneath them all." He first estimates the character and work of the two great movements which have made Modern Europe, the Renaissance, and the Reformation, giving a historical sketch of the latter in which the main feature of its operation in the various countries which it affected are briefly and graphically traced. Its effects he thus summarises:—"the Reformation, by virtue of its being a return, or an attempted return, to the religion of Christ, the purer and more genuine Christianity, accomplished far more than it attempted. It revealed ideas, energies, elements in religion that worked powerfully for human freedom, that created in the state a freer and a higher life, and created in man and in society nobler purpose, greater independence, that love of equal freedom and equal justice which but expresses the love of man." The remainder of the lecture is an eloquent appeal to his audience of working men to consider whence have come in their truest form the three ideas—Liberty, Equality, Fraternity—the "true Palladia of the order most to be desired."

In the last lecture the principles established in the preceding lectures are applied to the political, social and industrial questions of to-day, and it is shown that the "Christian religion supplies us for all political, civil and social questions with constructive and regulative principles of the noblest kind." "My hope for the future," he writes in concluding, "is in the ideal of Christ. My hope for man is in a more perfect and complete embodiment of the Christian religion. . . . Every Christian principle embodied in law or society, every Christian deed accomplished in industry, helps on the happier time."

The book comes at a time when its wholesome teaching is much required, and we wish it a wide circulation.

Hûna Lokoti Hîrâvalî : The Diamond necklace of English Proverbs ; containing the best English Proverbs with Telugu and English meanings, elaborate explanations, and Sanscrit equivalents. Edited by R. SIVASANKARA PANDIAH, B.A., Madras, 1885. Ten annas.

We have already had occasion to refer to Mr. Sivasankara Pandiah's labours in a similar field. The author deserves all praise for his untiring labour to promote the cause he has at heart, and we welcome every attempt to advance the morality, and religion of the Hindus, all the more when that attempt comes from within. How far a permanent influence will result from the method adopted will remain doubtful, yet, as "constant dropping wears the stone," no possible effort should be left untried.

As the title page explains, the volume is a selection of English proverbs explained both in Telugu and English. While apparently simple, the task is in reality somewhat ambitious. If proverbs consist of " much matter decocted into few words," if they are " gems of language, not only in the sense that they are small, bright, and of universal currency, but also in the mystery of their composition, as being a work of ages, a secret birth," then ability to interpret them must be sought in a long and intimate acquaintance with the life and thought of the nation in which they are current. It is here that the author necessarily fails. While giving a simple, clear and correct explanation of many, he frequently misinterprets others, showing not the faintest conception of even the general idea. A few examples taken at random will illustrate this sufficiently.

(12) " A drowning man will catch at a straw. *i. e.* A person, who proceeds in a downward course, will on one pretext or other drag others to him, and will try to spoil them ; therefore sensible men should not associate with them."

(219). " Do not halloo till you are out of the wood. *i.e.* It is good for us to be silent before wicked men."

(245.) " Everybody's business is nobody's business. *i.e.* We must honestly discharge our own duties, and must not unnecessarily pry into the affairs of other men."

(491.) " Marry your sons when you will, your daughters when you can *i.e.* If we do not marry our boys, it will be neither very injurious nor very blameable to us ; but if we do not marry our girls, we will get both mental anxieties and blame from the world."

(519.) " Never fall out with your bread and butter. *i.e.* We must be very quiet at the time of our taking food; it is then that we will get health and strength."

These are but a few examples which might be largely extended. Many explanations though on the right line, have lost the real force of the proverb, and deprived it of its true moral educative power. One example must suffice.

(116.) "As you sow, so you shall reap. *i. e.* If we do our work neatly we will become happy if we do it clumsily we will become miserable."

If however Mr. Sivasankara Pandiah has failed frequently to reach the true interpretation it is from no want of care but from the impossibility of interpreting 'the gems of English thought,' without a far more intimate acquaintance with English ideas and colloquial speech.

The Young India Club, or Essays in criticism of progressive thoughts and ideas among Educated Madrassees; Edited by P. ARMUGAM, M. Y. I. C: Calcutta, B. M. Ghose.

Regarding "The Young India Club," the information afforded by the editor is somewhat scanty and unsubstantial. It is of such a nature indeed, as to render the existence of the Club more than doubtful. The members are supposed to be educated young men, representative of various types of character and opinion that are to be found, at the present day among the younger members of native Indian Society. Mr. Krishnamacharry is chairman, a Brahmin; free, very free indeed, in his expressions, but somewhat backward in his actions. Among the other members are Rungasawmy Chetty, a man of excellent talents but of bad private life; Munisawmy Rao, who fell into the hands of Madame Blavatsky and became a free thinker; 'to write a treatise on Jesus or Rama is nothing to him; everything has been going on very smoothly since he became a freethinker, or in other words became free of thinking'. Christian, as a most excellent man, was admitted into the club: 'we young Hindus have a strong desire to show that we are tolerant.'

The pamphlet before us professes to give the report, in substance, of certain discussions held by this somewhat impalpable club.

The greater part of the pamphlet is occupied with an essay read by one of the members on the subject of Female Education in India. While readily acknowledging the good work that is being done by education in emancipating the women of India from the restraints of custom and prejudice, the writer feels strongly how far the system of education at present pursued is from producing that revolution of character, that entire change of attitude towards the existing condition of things, which is necessary if the women of India are to take their part in the regeneration of their native country. Girls are sent to school; they learn the mechanical arts of reading and writing; they have their minds stored with facts of science, or dry details of history. But what effect has all this upon the character of the girls, upon their habitual modes of thought and feeling? Does it inspire them with any love for a simple, healthy morality? Does it render them dissatisfied with the artificiality and deformity of their present lives? Towards such results as these, education, in the writer's opinion, has

hitherto made no advance. Education is valued. But it is valued only as a new jewel might be valued, only as enhancing the importance of a girl in the eyes of her family, in the eyes of her future husband, and most of all in her own eyes.

What is wanted is that education should be made simpler and more natural. It should be directed, not to filling the girls' minds with facts, useful or otherwise; but to training them in the exercise of every pure and healthy human instinct. For example, the girls ought to be taught religion. But,

"when I say *religion* I do not mean doctrine about God being infinite, immeasurable, with shape or without shape; no regard should be paid to all this. Let God simply be mentioned as our heavenly father, and let it be impressed on the girls that we are responsible to Him, each one of us individually"

So again, history ought to be taught to the girls. But,

"why are they to be burdened with names like those of Clive and Tippu, while the history of Dharmaraja is left out? Call this, if you please, mythology or obsolete nonsense. I emphatically maintain that there is more ethical teaching in Dharmaraja's history than in the whole history of India."

If this be the true idea of education the question turns out to be where can be found the men, who, whether as heads of families or as teachers in schools, are qualified to exercise this personal influence over the girls.

"If we, together with learning, want life and real development, the question as to the teacher becomes a very difficult one indeed. To illustrate what we mean by *life*, let us for example say that we want our girls to be *national*, that we want them to be enthusiastic for their country, for their language and also for their literature—this of course not meant in an *Olcottic* sense; for in him it is a mere general praise for things simply to get applause from fools. To be national is, I suppose to feel so much enthusiasm, to cherish so much admiration for all that was truly great in former times—for now-a-days there is nothing great except words—that it inspires us to realise it, follow what may. How is now a girl in the present state of things to get such elevated feelings, as none of the teachers have any interest in, far less any enthusiasm for their language and literature? Here is only one alternative, that the teacher must be a gentleman, who stands at least so high that he is higher than all sastrams, that he is master of them all, that he has a general knowledge of all those that have any historical worth,—the *epic dramas* for example;........that he knows this huge store-house so well, as to know at once in what godowns he is to seek for supply for the children, in what places for adults; in short a man who knows where to go and fetch materials from that can interest living beings, make them glad and happy, and be to them a help and strength to lead a beautiful human life. For this purpose such a gentleman is a desideratum, and only such a man and not our female teachers will be able to lead our girls in the right direction."

So long, however, as the ideas of Hindu Society remain what they

are, it is idle to look for female education in any real sense. Can it, for example, be anything else than mockery to talk of the moral and spiritual education of Hindu women, so long as that source of all the immorality of Hindu home life is suffered to remain untouched—early marriage? On this subject the writer states the truth in all its harshness. And in the same spirit, he protests against the idea sometimes expressed, that the education of girls must be carried out only so far as is 'consistent with the sense of national decency.'

"To make *inner* progress, and yet keep up with the national sense of decency" is to any Hindu almost as impossible as if I, a Brahmin, should say, in future, I will take food with any Europeans, but caste I will not break. Such a statement is ridiculous. "National sense of decency" is the great monster that now-a-days prevents all deep and inner development all over India."

Enough has been said to show the point of view from which the writer looks at the subject of female education. So far as he gives prominence to what he regards as the true end of education every one will go heartily along with him, and whether or not we accept without qualification his statements as to the actual outcome of the present system of female education, the opinions of one so well acquainted as the writer evidently is with the inner life of Hindu society, must at least command attention.

The whole pamphlet is one of much interest. It is written in a racy style; and the writer touches with his irony more than one of the weak points of present-day society in India.

Notes on Ingersoll, by REV. L. A. LAMBERT, Eighth Edition—111th thousand. London: Burns and Oates; also John Hodges, 13 Soho Square.

The name of Ingersoll, "the roving lecturer admission fifty cents," has, we believe, become tolerably familiar to 'young India,' or to that portion of it which is more ready to hear what is flippantly said *against* the Bible and Christianity than what is seriously said *for* them. This American wag, not being equal to competition with Artemus Ward, Mark Twain and others, in the legitimate field of humour, has for years past been making the sacred personages, institutions, and doctrines of the Bible the butt of his vulgarest ridicule. In his "Mistakes of Moses"—a book that is eagerly read and swallowed by many in this country who have never digested a single line of the writings and life of the great lawgiver himself—he deals blows of manly prowess at the honoured dead, who can only retort by silence; while in the dollar lecture-hall he has persistently outraged and misrepresented all that is held most sacred by the christian heart.

Throughout his utterances he adopts a policy that shows a good knowledge of human nature. The average man is not overburdened with the

faculty of discrimination; and Ingersoll has unbounded confidence in the credulity or gullibility of his readers, and of the bottomless ignorance of the class to which he appeals; and knows that while the few may investigate for themselves, the many will take his word for what he advances, and will inquire no further. Instead of attacking Christianity in its own position, he creates fictitious and absurd positions for it, and then proceeds with a show of logic and rhetoric to demolish the nonsense hatched in his own brain and paraded before the public as the principles of Christian philosophy. He is fond of harping on "candour and honour bright;" but of these virtues no trace is to be found in his attitude towards Christianity, and there is surely nothing more pitiable than dishonest ignorance trying to play the *role* of a teacher of mankind. Lacking the earnestness, penetration, and industry of the few notorious infidels of England and France, and being wholly destitute of originality, he has had to draw liberally from the writings of Hobbes and Bolingbroke, Paine and Voltaire; and has consequently failed to advance anything new against Christianity. Indeed it were too much to expect anything new from a modern infidel. From the time of Celsus and Porphyry, who in the second and third centuries presented anti-Christianity under all its forms and whose attacks were so completely parried in the great apologetic work of Origen, the erudite champion of the Church, down to the renewed satire of the last century, the resources of human invention have been exhausted in the attempt to overthrow Christianity.

It is sometimes observed that little is done to-day in the way of directly meeting the wearisome iterations and misrepresentations of infidelity. The reason of the silence is evident to men of sense. "It is not the duty of Christian theologians," says the writer of the *Notes on Ingersoll*, "to turn aside to meet every blatant blasphemer who wags his tongue against Christianity for dollars, under the pretence of being a philosopher. They decline to talk with you (Ingersoll) about theology on the same principle that a Marshall, a Taney, or an Evarts would decline to discuss Common Law or the Code Justinian with a mountebank." Let modern infidel writers afford some evidence of having read and re-read *one* standard Christian apologist, and theologians will be prepared to meet them. Sophistry and calumny have been answered again and again; and when a quack like Ingersoll seeks to galvanise slain corpses into a momentary appearance of life, and manifests complete ignorance of these great defences of the faith to which no infidel of the past has ever yet replied, the Christian teachers of the present day, who have gone somewhat deeper into philosophy and theology, are not bound to reprint those proofs at the call of every glib little whiffler of the shallow school, and waste their time in doing what has already been done a hundred times. Questions that deserve fresh answers should have some sense in them.

Infidelity may storm and scream; Gibbons, Diderots, and Ingersolls may appear from time to time, as plagues and insanity have also appeared, but Christianity survives the one as humanity survives the other. Christianity is no more on its trial than is the Sun in the heavens: at any rate it will be time to think of new defences when the old ones have been carried.

The proper way to answer Ingersoll is not to defend Christianity, which needs no justification, but to analyse every rash statement he advances, every spurious argument, every falacious inference; to expose the Egotism and infallibility of writings that are simply a revelation of the man's own character—"a mere evolution of *himself* on paper." And this is admirably done in the work before us. The writer takes this "notorious little fraud"—Ingersoll—on his own ground; calls him out to a fair theological tournament; returns the thrusts of the valiant knight with brilliant repartees; pursues him with relentless cruelty, step by step, through all his tortuous windings; lays bare this profoundly original thinker, this orator of "laughter and applause," who mistakes curious listeners for disciples, and applause for approval, and shows him to be the veriest of plagiarists, who has palmed off as his own the worn-out and oft refuted objections of better infidels than he; dissects this philosophical charlatan to the very marrow of his bones; and punctures the bubble of infidelity until there is nothing left. All who have been puzzled and perhaps poisoned by the spurious pen of Ingersoll should read these *Notes.* They consist of a running dialogue between the infidel and his commentator; and the latter, with utmost fairness, always allows the former to speak for himself, and in his own very words.

In order to convey an idea of what is thus so successfully done, we give a few examples of the dialogue; and express the hope that the little book may have a wide circulation in this country. To lovers of smart writing, here is an ample treat in store; while honest searchers after truth will find a sturdy and trustworthy guide.

INGERSOLL—"The mind of every thoughtful man is forced to one of two conclusions: Either that the universe is self-existent, or that it was created by a self-existent being. To my mind there is far more difficulty in the second hypothesis than in the first."

COMMENT—It is to be regretted that you did not take the time and space to show the difference in the weight of those difficulties—to show how the existence of an eternal self-existent Creator presents more difficulties to the mind than does the existence of eternal matter. The existence of an eternal Creator is not *contrary* to reason. While the existence of eternal matter, as we have seen, involves the co-existence of mutually destructive attributes in the same subject at the same time, and is, therefore, contradictory to reason.

There have been many men of thoughtful minds who did not see that they were forced to adopt either of your two conclusions. The pantheists of ancient and modern times, of India and Europe, hold that the universe was neither

eternal nor created, but that it was an *emanation* from God, having no real existence of its own—a mere transient mode of God's being. These philosophers were more radical than you. * * *

They wrote many books to elucidate what you dismiss in a half a dozen lines. They erred in denying the reality of matter: you err in asserting its eternal existence. To assert God and deny matter shows a higher philosophical culture than to assert matter and deny God.

INGERSOLL—"We find God, and we then say: He is so wonderful that he must *not* have had a maker."

COMMENT—You say this, but "we" don't. When we find God, we find the self-existent Being, infinite and eternal, and therefore we say, he must *not* have had a maker. This is the way the Christian reasons, and it is somewhat different from the childish nonsense you would put into his mouth.

INGERSOLL—"Was there no design in having an infinite designer?"

COMMENT—None whatever, since there cannot be anything back of the infinite and eternal designer. There can be nothing more infinite, than the infinite, nothing prior to the eternal. It is as if you should ask: Is there anything more circular than a circle, or anything squarer than a square?

INGERSOLL—"For me it is hard to see the plan or design in earthquakes and pestilences."

COMMENT—This is not surprising, since you have, with commendable humility, admitted that what you know about questions like these is almost infinitely limited. Until you see or understand the design, it is inconsistent in you to condemn it.

INGERSOLL—"The justice of God is not visible to me in the history of this world."

COMMENT—Might not this strange circumstance arise from intellectual Staphyloma? Grant that it is not visible to you, does it follow that it is not in this world? Does your failure to see it demonstrate that it is not? When you make your limited vision the measure of God's justice you usurp the attributes of the infinite, put your judgment above his, and attempt to assume his place. Men have been kindly, but firmly consigned to insane asylums for such philosophy; and curious visitors meet with them almost every day.

INGERSOLL—"It (reason) is the intellectual capital of the soul, the only light the only guide."

COMMENT—Reason is the soul or intellect itself in conscious action; hence it cannot be its own intellectual capital, or its only light and guide. You seem to forget what you have said before, namely, that reason is the *result* of experience. Now, to say that reason is the only light and guide of the soul, and at the same time the result of experience, is to contradict yourself.

INGERSOLL—"He (God) sent abroad lying spirits to deceive his own prophets."

COMMENT—I will give one hundred dollars to the poor of this village if you or any of your disciples will make good your statement. I am familiar with the texts in Kings and Ezekiel which you probably imagine will bear you out, but if you carefully compare those texts with your statement you will find that your zeal has run away with your discretion, and that your hatred of your Maker is more intense than your love for the truth.

God abhors lying spirits, false prophets, false philosophers and deceivers of

all kinds, ancient and modern, and yet he permits them to exist because he cannot make them impossible without destroying free will or human liberty. There were laws enacted condemning these false prophets and other popular seducers, but these laws were not enforced because the false prophets, etc., flattered the passions of the people, telling them pleasant things. They were popular lecturers in their day, and they did not die without issue.

INGERSOLL—"Slavery includes all other crimes. It is the joint product of the kidnapper, pirate, thief murderer, and hypocrite."

COMMENT—How does it *include* all other crimes if it be the joint product of them? A product is an effect. If slavery be a product of crimes it cannot include those crimes; for to include them it must exist prior to them, and if it exist prior to them, it cannot be a product of them. You should not contradict yourself. It shows that you have a bad memory, or that there is a screw loose in your logical machine.

INGERSOLL—"In the moral code (of the Old Testament) not one word is found on the subject of polygamy."

COMMENT—Then why did you say that the Bible taught polygamy as the highest form of virtue? If you look in Genesis, Chap. II., verse 24, you will find the following words: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his *wife*, (not wives), and they shall be *two* in *one* flesh." This is the law in the case, is it not against polygamy? This one text is sufficient to upset all your talk about tho Bible teaching polygamy.

But on what principle do *you* condemn polygamy?

Deny God and assert unlimited liberty, and where is the wrong in polygamy? Why should not a man have all the wives he wants, if there is no God to forbid it, and no woman to refuse?

INGERSOLL—"God knew that He taught the Jewish people but little of importance."

COMMENT—You only imagine that you know this. You must not confound your knowledge with that of Jehovah. How do you know what he knew? You evidently do not need to pray the old Scotch dominie's prayer: "O Lord, gie us a gude conceit o' oursel'."

INGERSOLL—"What we must say is that, being good men, the apostles were mistaken."

COMMENT—Then you know more about events that transpired nearly two thousand years ago than those who were eye-witnesses of them!

Your reasoning stated in form is this:

Some men have been mistaken.

Therefore the founders of Christianity were mistaken. A boy who could reason no better than this ought to have his ears boxed—if boxes large enough could be found.

INGERSOLL—"What became of Lazarus?"

COMMENT—It is probable that he lived an honest life, and did not spend his time in asking foolish questions.

INGERSOLL—"Is it not wonderful that Luke and Matthew do not agree on a single name of Christ's ancestors for thirty-seven generations?"

COMMENT—It is wonderful only to those who are ignorant of the fact that

Matthew gives the ancestors of Joseph, while Luke gives the ancestors of Mary, the Mother of God.

Are your ancestors on your mother's side all Ingersolls? Must your maternal and paternal ancestors necessarily have the same name? A careful study of Christian writers on these subjects would save you a good deal of ignorant blundering.

INGERSOLL—"My doctrine is that there is only one way to be saved, and that is to act in harmony with your surroundings—to live in accordance with the facts of your being."

COMMENT—"Your doctrine" now is, that there is one way at least, to be saved—it is "to act in harmony with your surroundings." Well, your surroundings are certainly Christian. If you lived among Mormons you should be a Mormon; if in Turkey you should have a harem and sit cross-legged like a tailor; if among Thugs you should be a Thug: if among assassins an assassin; if among thieves, a thief! This theory has the advantage of being in harmony with the "elastic cord of human feelings."

INGERSOLL—"For the honest infidel, according to the American Evangelical pulpit, there is no heaven."

COMMENT—The cook-book says: The first step in cooking a hare is to catch it. I do not believe any infidel will ever be damned for his honesty. I have no authority to speak for the American Evangelical pulpit, but I suppose if it could be convinced of the "honesty" of an infidel, and his decency in the other respects, it would check him through as a victim of defective phrenal development.

INGERSOLL—"Everything is right that tends to the happiness of mankind."

COMMENT—Granted. But who is to determine what tends to the happiness of mankind? Is every action of your life governed by that vague rule? Do you, before performing an act, pause to reflect whether that act, in the long run, in all the eventualities of human existence here and hereafter, will tend in the general sum to the happiness of mankind? Of course you don't. Such a calculation is beyond the power of man, hence your definition of right is vain and profitless.

INGERSOLL—"Consequences determine the quality of an action."

COMMENT—This then is your standard by which to determine whether a human act is good or evil, wicked or holy. It is a remarkable coincidence that the assassin of President Garfield justified his act on this very principle. His last words on the scaffold were: "Only good has come from it." * * But the full and ultimate consequences of no act can be known by man, for the *consequences* of an act become in their turn the *causes* of other acts, whose consequences are the causes of other acts still, and thus on indefinitely. * * No man can know this; and hence, according to your criterion, no man can know the nature of any given act.

INGERSOLL—"If consequences are good, so is the action."

COMMENT—According to this dictum, you cannot say a cold-blooded murder or an assassination is good or bad until you have learned the consequences of it! The consequences of Garfield's taking off can never be known to man. Then, according to your philosophy, it can never be known whether his murder was a crime or a virtue! Are you not afraid that your philosophy may

put a bee into the head of some religious fanatic, who misled by your teachings, might consider his killing of you a virtuous and holy act, foolisly imagining that the result of it might, in its consequences, prove beneficial to society and religion?

INGERSOLL—"Consequences are the standard by which actions are judged."

COMMENT—Then since the consequences of acts cannot be known, this standard cannot be known. Philosophers heretofore held that effects took their nature from their cause, and not the cause from the effects. They could not see how that which *is* could take its nature from that which *is not* or how an effect could be the cause of its own cause's nature. They were keen-sighted enough to see that this involved the dogma of Lord Dundreary, that the tail wags the dog.

NOTES AND EXTRACTS.

The recommendations of the late Education Commission on Secondary Education (which includes what is generally known in this Presidency as Middle and High School Education) begin with the two following paragraphs. (1) "That in the upper classes of High Schools there be two divisions—one leading to the Entrance Examination of the Universities, the other of a more practical character, intended to fit youths for commercial or other non-literary pursuits. (2) That where the proposed bifurcation in secondary schools is carried out, the certificate of having passed by the final standard, or, if necessary, by any lower standard, of either of the proposed alternative courses, be accepted as a sufficient general test of fitness for the public service." During the two years and more which have elapsed since these recommendations were recorded, no practical steps of any kind seem to have been taken to bring about the proposed bifurcation. We are glad, however, to find that a movement is now in progress to carry out—with every prospect of success—this most desirable end. Practical difficulties in the shape of Government Grants, and Government and University Examinations, have doubtless deterred Educationalists from venturing upon innovations, but Mr. Adam, the Principal of Pacheappa's College, Madras, has shown how these difficulties can be overcome. He points out that:—

"The whole course of education in this Presidency is broadly divided into two stages by what is called the Middle School Examination. This Examination is really held by the Commissioner for the Uncovenanted Service Examination, it forms the Special and General Education Tests, and must have been passed by candidates for the Pleaders' Test. The general importance of the Examination is thus of the first magnitude, while it possesses additional special importance to School Managers from the fact that it practically renders the receipt of a Government Grant dependent, *inter alia*, upon conformity to the regulations of the Department with regard to this Examina-

tion. To make assurance doubly sure, schools which could afford to dispense with Government assistance, will not be recognised unless they comply with the Government Rules, the penalty of non-recognition being that each pupil must pay an Examination fee of Rs. 8, as against Rs. 3 in recognised schools. The Middle School Examination thus forms a barrier behind which the whole youth of the Presidency is educationally dammed up, and it is only after these gates have been opened that education is left free to follow its own bent. Practically, the aim of every schoolboy is to pass the Middle School Examination, and all Primary and Secondary education is directed to that goal. It will consequently be evident not only that there would be no inducement, but that it would be suicidal, for School Managers to start commercial classes unless the Scheme of the Middle School Examination made provision for Commercial Education, under conditions similar to those recently laid down for Science, Art and Industrial Schools and Classes."

Accordingly Mr. Adam addressed a letter to the Director of Public Instruction wherein he first pointed out the great want of commercial training, his own opinion being supported by forcible letters from the Hon'ble J. A. Boyson (Messrs. Binny and Co.), Mr. P. MacFadyen (Messrs. Arbuthnot and Co.) and representatives of other mercantile firms and bankers in Madras. In the second place he showed how the Middle School notification could be so amended as to at once enable School Managers to supply the necessary training. Mr. Grigg entered most cordially into these views, which were also powerfully supported by the local press. Commercial Education has consequently been put upon a footing exactly equivalent to that upon which Science, Arts, and Industries now stand. The Middle School candidate, has to pass in three compulsory fixed subjects, and in two other subjects as to which he is allowed a certain option. This option can now be exercised by the selection of two out of the following branches:—Commercial Arithmetic; Commercial Correspondence; Superior Penmanship and spelling; Commercial Geography; Book keeping; Political Economy; Insurance. One of the two must be either Commercial Arithmetic or Commercial Correspondence; and superior penmanship and spelling will be included in the English Test for such candidates. There is thus no reason why every Middle School in the Presidency should not teach such subjects and at the very earliest period turn the minds of a portion of the intelligent youngsters of the country towards commercial pursuits. Nor should it be forgotten that any one who has once passed the Middle School Examination or has Matriculated can at any time come up for Examination in these extra subjects on payment of a fee of Two Rupees. Certficates signed by the Examiners are granted to the successful candidates.

To overcome the difficulty in procuring suitable text books, Mr. Adam is making arrangements for the speedy publication of special Manuals embracing most of the above named subjects. The Manual for Commercial

Geography will be written by himself, while the accompanying Atlas is in course of preparation by a well known Edinburgh firm of Map publishers. This will include, *inter alia*, Physical, Agricultural, Industrial, Railway and Watershed Maps of India. Other Manuals will be prepared by fully qualified writers under Mr. Adam's supervision. We understand that negotiations are in progress which will probably result in the opening of a special school in Madras, fully equipped in every way, with the best masters available and sufficient funds to render the experiment a thorough one, which is the only way probably in which to ensure success. With such a model before them, few schools will fail to follow the example.

Nor is it intended to neglect these pupils after the Middle School barrier has been passed. A scheme has been drawn up,—to which being at present *sub judice* we cannot refer in detail—with the view of diverting from the Matriculation Examination of the University a few hundreds out of the thousands who yearly and vainly attempt to surmount it. An endeavour will also be made, by means of morning and evening lectures, to provide more advanced instruction for teachers, clerks, and graduates who may, rather late in the day, find the paths of the philosophers not always strewn with plentiful rice. In short, the attempt will be made to graft something after the style of the Birkbeck Institution upon the ordinary Madras School. We can only say the plan ought to succeed and Madras will be very blind to its own interest if it fails to do everything in its power to make it succeed. We hope when details have been definitely settled to recur again to this larger side of the question.

Up till now the Government has provided a series of District scholarships tenable at any of the Colleges connected with the Department. In districts in which a first grade College existed no scholarship was granted, in those in which there was a second grade College a scholarship was given to the student from the district who stood first in the F. A., examination, and in those districts in which there was no College, one was given to the candidate standing highest in the matriculation examination. This system of assigning the scholarships from the results of the University examinations was open to serious objections, for it requires only a glance at the Report of the University Syndicate to show that there is not sufficient uniformity in the standards of examination in the various vernaculars to place candidates who choose different optional languages on a footing of equality. The whole system has now been changed, and instead of giving a series of scholarships Government offers, instead, a grant-in-aid of one third on all scholarships given under approved conditions. Taking advantage of this offer the Council of the Christian College has resolved to institute some District scholarships tenable at the

Christian College. Of course it is impossible to offer scholarships for all the districts in the Presidency and so a selection has been made of those in which, for various reasons, there seemed to be the greatest need for them. Eight scholarships of Rupees 73 per term have been offered to students from Ganjam, Kistna, Salem, Coimbatore, Malabar, South Canara, Tinnevelly and the Municipality of Negapatam who have passed the First Examination in Arts and undertake to prosecute their studies for the B. A. degree. Six scholarships of Rupees 61 per term have been offered to students from the districts of Nellore, Vizagapatam, Kurnool, Cuddapah, Bellary and North Arcot who have passed the Matriculation examination and undertake to study for the B. A. degree. For these scholarships local examinations will be held in the various districts on the tenth, or if that be a Sunday, on the eleventh day after the publication at the Senate House of the results of the First in Arts and Matriculation examinations. The subject of examination will be English Composition and the English Language generally, but with some special reference to the texts which the candidates have had to study for the University Examinations.

In addition to these open scholarships, others will be offered for competition amongst students on the roll of the Christian College. One of Rupees 79 per term will be given to the student of the Third, or Junior B.A. class, who having been in the class for at least two terms stands highest in the subjects common to all the students, in the College Examinations at the close of the present term. One of Rupees 67 per term goes under similar conditions to the best student in the First class, and one of Rupees 61 per term to the best in the Matriculation class. In the Third class of 1886 a scholarship of Rupees 25 per term will be awarded on the results of a special examination in Mathematics to students taking up Branch I (Mathematics and Natural Philosophy) as their optional subject, and two of Rupees 20 and Rupees 15 respectively on the results of an examination on Physiology, to students taking up Branch III (Natural Science) as their optional subject for the B. A. Examination. Applications for the District scholarships must be sent in to the Principal before the 31st of December. Those candidates who are enrolled as students of the Christian College before the date of the examination will be examined in Madras.

A very serious accident has happened to the new buildings of the Christian College through the falling of the lofty tower which was almost completed. The immediate cause of the accident was the heavy rain which accompanied the cyclone at the beginning of last month. The upper part of the main tower fell on the 2nd of November but the turret containing the staircase remained standing. This turret was carefully examined by the consulting architect to government and the

municipal engineer and was declared to be perfectly safe. At the same time it was though prudent to take down the upper part, and this had just been safely accomplished when the excessive rainfall of the 14th to 18th began. The rain was accompanied by a strong northerly wind which drove the water against the turret and completely soaked it on the windward side. The result was that the turret fell on the morning of the 19th and falling towards the north it came down on the roof of the new hall carrying away four of the iron trusses and fully half of the roof. The falling debris also destroyed a considerable part of the teak-wood floor and did much damage to the tiffin rooms below. Part of the south wall and west gable of the hall were damaged by the first fall but otherwise the injury to the walls is, apparently, slight.

It is too early yet to say with any certainty what the real cause of the accident was, neither can we estimate with accuracy the sum that will be required to restore the buildings. Apart altogether from the money loss the accident is a very serious one, for the loss of the accomodation which was so urgently required will give rise to no small amount of inconvenience during next session. The college Council has appointed a small sub-committee to make an appeal to the public for the funds necessary to restore the hall and to provide the other class-rooms required, either by rebuilding the tower, or otherwise as may seem best. A very pleasing feature of what is in other respects so trying is the way in which a number of old students have come forward to render help to their College in its need. It may be well to point out that if the building had once been completed it would in all probability have been perfectly secure. Mr. Chisholm in a report to the Council writes :—

"It appears that in work of this class the mortar does not set till many months after it has been built and that it, year by year, gets harder, so in spite of the present defective state, if they had survived the unusual strain to which complete saturation subjected them both tower and turret might have stood for centuries."

SCIENCE JOTTINGS.

M. Verbeeck who was sent by the Dutch Indian Government to investigate the cause and effects of the tremendous eruption of Krakatao in 1883 has now published his report. Krakatao lies at the intersection of three great fissures in the earth's crust and is thus particularly liable to disturbance through the action of seismic forces. If we accept the steam theory of volcanic action, it seems probable that the immediate cause of the great eruption was the earthquake on September 1st, 1880 which probably affected the fissures in such a way as to permit water to pass more freely to the regions of high tempera-

ture below. The amount of materials ejected by the eruption is calculated as amounting to at least 18 cubic Kilometres or say 3½ cubic miles. Some of the ejected matter reached a height of more than 30 miles and the pieces thrown up varied in size from blocks of one cubic metre to the finest dust. M. Verbeeck believes that the finest particles forced by the steam into the upper air did not descend, but were carried westward by strong east winds making twice the circuit of the earth and causing the phenomena observed at various places of a blue and green sun and moon. He farther ascribes the blue and green colours to the solid particles and the subsequent red glows to the large quantity of aqueous vapour. Most physicists, we fancy, if they accepted the former part of his theory would reverse the latter and ascribe the green and blue colours to the vapour and the red sunsets to the dust.

A curious feature brought to light by the investigation is the cause of the cold felt at Batavia and other places during the fall of the ashes. These had been thrown into the very cold regions of the upper air and fell back to the earth as cold bodies. Heavy electrical discharges occurred continuously round the ash cloud.

The sound of the explosion was heard over an area amounting to one-fourteenth part of the whole surface of the earth and the great air wave, as we formerly pointed out, travelled over the whole earth and was recorded on barograms at many observatories. Curiously enough the time of the heaviest explosion has had to be calculated from observations made many hundred miles away from Krakatao, the barogram at Sydney N. S. W. being used for this purpose and the result being checked by the markings of the indicator at the Batavia gas-works. This air wave travelled with a velocity considerably less than that of sound, and is supposed to have taken about 35½ hours to complete the circuit of the earth.

As regards the changes in the depth of the sea the information is very complete. What was formerly the northern part of Krakatoa is now covered with water to a depth of between a hundred and a hundred and fifty fathoms and subsidence has taken place over an area of about 75 square Kilometres. The part of the Peak which disappeared was about one cubic Kilometre in size and Mr. Verbeeck considers that the fall of so large a mass into the sea is quite sufficient to account for the disasterous sea wave which swept over the surrounding low lands. The wave travelled with great velocity reaching Aden, a distance of 3,800 nautical miles, in twelve hours. Calculations made from the velocity of the propagation of the wave in different directions give a measure of the average depth of the ocean along certain lines. Thus between Krakatao and

South Georgia the average depth obtained is 6,340 metres which would indicate the existence of a deep basin to the west and south-west of Australia, at present unknown.

M. Verbeeck holds that the earthquakes and volcanic eruptions occurring in other parts of the world soon after the Krakatao eruption were directly connected with the great eruption. He maintains, in spite of the very strong evidence to the contrary, that the interior of our globe still remains in a molten state and that this explains how, even at the antipodes, the eruption at Krakatao caused eruptions in the Antilles. The work is illustrated by twenty-five coloured drawings, and though we may hesitate to agree with some of the author's conclusions we cannot fail to accept the work as a most valuable contribution to the literature of Seismology.

Many of our readers no doubt possess barometers and when the weather looks threatening carefully watch the rise and fall. In Madras, however, the readings are of no value unless due allowance be made for the daily tide, for unless this be done the barometer may appear to be rising while it is actually falling or falling when it is really rising. The following table gives the correction for each hour during the winter months, October to March. + means that the barometer is above the mean and therefore the correction has to be *subtracted*, — that the barometer is below the mean and therefore the correction has to be *added*. The table is extracted from a sheet issued some years ago by Mr. Pogson and applies strictly only to Madras. It will, however, probably be found to apply fairly well to most places at or near the sea-level in this Presidency. At hill stations the amount of tide is much less.

MORNING.

Hours............	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Correction........	0·00	−0·02	−0·03	−0·03	−0·02	0·00	+0·02	+0·04	+0·06	+0·06	+0·04	+0·02

AFTERNOON.

Hours............	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Correction........	−0·01	−0·04	−0·05	−0·06	−0·05	−0·03	−0·01	+0·01	+0·03	+0·03	+0·02	+0·01

Dr. Sophus Tromholt writing to a Norwegian Journal about the new star in the nebula of Andromeda points out that in a story written by Maurus Jókai in 1851 the star is referred to. According to this tale, which is supposed to be founded on an old Jewish legend, the Evil Spirit,

Asafiel, revealed to King Saul and his sons the star in the nebula, and predicted that those who could not see it should fall in the impending battle. The position of the star is said to be described so accurately that there can be no doubt that it is the one in question. If the tale is really founded on an old Jewish legend and not simply a guess, it seems probable that the new star is a variable with a very long period, and that it has been observed previously at some of its periods of maximum brightness. We may add that the star has been visible to the naked eye on the present occasion.

A fine display of meteors was observed all over India and in parts of Europe on the night of the 27th November. From telegrams received at the Madras Observatory from Kiel and Dunecht it seems that they may with great probability be ascribed to the swarm of meteors which gave the magnificent display in November 1872. These, it will be remembered, were connected with a comet which was discovered by Mr. Pogson in Madras immediately after the shower and which was by some supposed to be the lost comet of Biela and by others to be a new comet. We hope to give more information on this subject next month, when we hope also to be able to give some details of a new nebula which has appeared near the great nebula in Andromeda.

When the clouds clear away towards the middle of this month several of the planets will be favourably situated for observation. Jupiter will be well seen in the morning, as it rises more than five hours before the sun and crosses the meridian about half past six. It is not far from the famous double star γ Virginis. It will be in quadrature with the sun on the 26th. Venus is an evening star and was at greatest elongation on the 8th. Saturn, whose ring is still a fine object in a telescope of even moderate power, can be well seen in the evening. It crosses the meridian soon after midnight. It is situated in Gemini and lies nearly on a line joining *Nath* in the north horn of the bull and *Procyon* in Canis Minor. Mars is in Leo, almost on a line joining *Regulus* to γ Virginis. Mercury is in inferior conjunction with the sun on the 18th and is consequently invisible.

C. M. S.

RECENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

Sir John Lubbock sends to the *Contemporary* an interesting account of observations that have recently been made by himself and others on the habits of ants, bees and wasps. M. Fabre, he informs us, has been making experiments in order to discover if animals have, as some affirm, a special "sense of direction." He took ten bees, marked them, put them in a bag and carried them half a kilometre in one direction. He then whirled the bag rapidly round his head for a number of times, and afterwards started off in an opposite direction, carrying them to a distance

from their home of 3 kilometres. Here he again whirled them round, and then let them go one by one. They made one or two turns round him and then flew off in the direction of home. In the meanwhile his daughter Antonia was on the watch. The first bee did the mile and three quarters in a quarter of an hour. Some hours after two more returned, the other seven did not reappear. He repeated the experiment next day with other bees, and again 3 out of 10 found their way home, the first in five minutes, the other two within an hour. The experiments were continued with variations as to distance, and the number of bees taken, and with pretty uniform results. An examination of these results, however, has led Sir John Lubbock to doubt the Professor's conclusions. It would appear that out of 144 bees experimented with, only 47 returned. The remainder appear to have lost their way.

"May not," asks Sir John, "the 47 have found theirs by sight or by accident? Instinct, however inferior to reason has the advantage of being generally unerring. When two out of three bees went wrong, we may, I think, safely dismiss the idea of instinct."

He reminds us of how natural it would be to suppose that of 150 bees let off at random two miles from home 30 should find themselves within a mile of home and consequently would know where they were. Besides if M. Fabre's bees had returned by a sense of direction they would have done so in less than five minutes, which was his shortest record.

The habits of certain solitary wasps also give rise to one of the most interesting questions in connection with instinct.

"The ammophila, for instance, having built her cell places in it as food for her young a full grown larva of noctua segetum. Now if the larva were uninjured, it would struggle to escape and almost inevitably destroy the egg, nor would it permit itself to be eaten; on the other hand, if it were killed it would decay and become unfit for food. The insect, however, avoids both horns of the dilemma. Having found her prey, she pierces with her sting the membrane between the head and the first segment of the body, thus nearly disabling the caterpillar, and then proceeds to inflict eight more wounds between the following segments; lastly crushing the head and thus completely paralysing her victim, but not actually killing it; so that it lies helpless and motionless, but, though living, let us hope insensible."

The spots selected for the wound are "exactly those occupied by the ganglia, not one wound is misplaced or thrown away." M. Fabre argues that this instinct cannot have been acquired, and that certainly chance cannot explain the difficulty. But Sir John Lubbock gives instances which prove that it is not unusual or unaccountable that an animal of prey should know where its victim is most vulnerable. He also gives interesting details as to similar practices of other species of wasps in regard to the supplying of food for their young, and does not regard it as impossible that by the experience of ages the ammophila should have learnt,

"where their sting would be most effective, and thus saving themselves the trouble of capturing a number of victims, have found that it was less trouble to select a fine fat common caterpillar of Noctua Segetum, and so have gradually acquired their present habits."

Some remarkable cases of the stupidity of insects are given. M. Fabre was observing a bee preparing a cell for her egg. She was filling it with honey and preparing the last load of mortar with which she would close it as soon as she had laid her egg. During one of the journeys of the bee he broke down part of the cell-covering, at another time removed part of the cell wall. These breaches the bee at once repaired, as they were exactly in the natural order of her work. He afterwards, however, pierced a hole in the cell immediately below where the bee was at work and through which the honey began to exude.

"The poor stupid little bee, however, never thought of repairing the breach. She worked on as if nothing had happened. In her alternate journeys she brought first mortar and then honey, which however ran out again as fast as it was poured in. This experiment he repeated over and over again, with various modifications in detail, but always with the

same result. It may be suggested that possibly the bee was unable to stop the hole once formed. But that could not have been the case. M. Fabre took one of the pellets of mortar brought by the bee, and successfully stopped the hole himself. The omission therefore was due, not to want of power but of intellect"

The concluding part of the article contains some interesting facts about ants, and,

"not the least interesting fact which has resulted from my (Sir John Lubbock's) observations has been the unexpected longevity of these interesting insects. The general opinion used to be that they lived for a single season, like wasps. . . . . . I have kept workers of Lasius niger and Formica fusca for more than seven years. But what is more remarkable still, I have two queens of the latter species which I have kept ever since 1874, and which, as they were then full grown, must now be nearly twelve years old. They laid fertile eggs again this year, a fact the interest of which physiologists will recognise. Although a little stiff in the joints, and less active than they once were, they are still strong and well."

The last number of the *London Quarterly Review* contains an article on the Indian Education Commission written by an old Madrassee. It concludes thus :—

"We trust that nothing will lead Missionary Societies to contract their operations in any department of education. In the higher department, they are, in our judgment, more needed than ever. There is no fear that *they* will "glut the market," for there is a practically unlimited sphere of honorable toil for their Christian *alumni*; and as for the rest, secular attainments being equal, they will always be at a premium. Besides, the teaching of government and Secular Colleges undoubtedly destroys the ancestral faith without supplying a better. We are sometimes told from the platform that it prepares the young men for the missionary evangelist. Would that this pleasing theory were true! We have found, on the contrary, that a purely secular curriculum, unsupplemented by the sunday-school or domestic training, tends to disgust its subjects with religion altogether, whilst it turns multitudes of them into disciples of Bradlaugh and Ingersoll, whose writings are being widely, circulated among them.

Is the Church of Christ, then prepared to sound the note of retreat before such foes?

We are driven in very self-defence, to maintain a firm, nay an aggressive attitude against the cultured infidelity that is rapidly honey-combing the middle and upper classes of India. It is asked what we would do, we reply: establish at least one undenominational Christian College for each of the three Presidencies, carrying out the idea so successfully inaugurated at Madras by the Rev. W. Miller. But it must, of course, be a *sine quâ non* that they are permanently manned by a staff of Professors equal in efficiency to those of the government. If there is an objection to setting ministers to this kind of work, let us secure competent laymen. But they must not be *mere scholars*, but also earnest Christians. Fees and grants-in-aid will go a long way towards meeting the cost of such establishments, and surely the public spirit of the united Churches of Britain, America, and Germany, would supply the rest. We would also, by various agencies which we have not time now to suggest, make the evangelization of the educated Hindus a *special and distinct field of labour*, on the same principle that we have Zenana Missions for the upper classes of the females. It is needless to add that such colleges, to answer the end designed, must be fed by a goodly number of thoroughly efficient high schools, which, however, might be largely self-supporting.

As to the *primary* education of boys, the field is so vast that we do not see how Missionary Societies can cultivate it to any considerable extent, especially as they will naturally prefer to expend their resources upon girl's and Zenana work. Here, for the reasons already stated, we have very strong hope that, before long substantial help will be given by the local governments, and by municipal boards under their direction. Here, too, we feel assured that no argument is necessary to persuade the Christian Churches of Britain, and America to do their utmost to maintain their well earned reputation, and to derive the fullest benefit from the anticipated liberality of the State."

The November number of *The Nineteenth Century* opens with an article which will excite considerable interest —the 'Dawn of Creation and of Worship' by Mr. Gladstone. The article is in the first instance a reply to Dr. Réville, who, in his *Prolegomènes de l'Histoire des Religions*, referred to Mr. Gladstone as a representative "of those writers who find warrant for the assertion of a primitive revelation in the testimony of the Holy Scriptures," Dr. Réville's information

was gained from a book published nearly thirty years ago in which Mr. Gladstone, while contending for a connection between some pictures in the Homeric poems and Hebrew traditions, assumed the early chapters of Genesis to be a Divine revelation. On several points Mr. Gladstone has in later works modified the opinions there expressed, and his present contention may be stated in his own words.

"It is, first, that many important pictures drawn, and indications given, in the Homeric poems supply evidence that cannot be confuted not only of an ideal but of an historical relationship to the Hebrew traditions, (1) and mainly, as they are recorded in the Book of Genesis; (2) as less authentically to be gathered from the later Hebrew learning; and (3) as illustrated from extraneous sources. Secondly, any attempt to expound the Olympian mythology of Homer by simple reference to a solar theory, or even to nature worship in a larger sense, is simply a plea for a verdict against the evidence."

To assert the historical identity of some Homeric pictures and Hebrew traditions does not necessarily involve the assumption of the divine revelation of the latter, and Mr. Gladstone's contention will, therefore, remain unaffected by the proof or disproof of a primitive revelation. But this primitive revelation he is prepared to assert as against Dr. Réville, and the interest of the article centres round this question. They start from the same standpoint, and assume that this primitive revelation is proved or disproved by the harmony or want of harmony of the account of the Creation in Genesis with scientific facts. The result therefore will have comparatively little interest for those who hold that revelation has all along been concerned with the imparting of spiritual truths, rather than with the teaching of facts connected with the cosmogony.

Dr. Réville urges that the scientific errors in the account of the Creation in Genesis prove the absence of a revelation.

(1) "It speaks of heaven as a solid vault, (2) It places the Creation of the stars after that of the earth, and so places them solely for its use. (3) It introduces the vegetable kingdom before that kingdom could be subjected to the action of solar light."

These propositions Mr. Gladstone examines in detail. As for the first, he simply points to the fact that the best Hebrew scholarship translates the Hebrew not by firmament but by *expanse.*

"As to the second (*a*) it is *not* said in the sacred text that the stars were made solely for the use of the earth; (*b*) it is true no other use is mentioned. But . . . what was the purpose of the narrative? Not to rear cosmic philosophers, but to furnish ordinary men with some idea of what the Creator had done in the way of providing for them a home, and giving them a place in nature."

Further, the stars, he urges are not said to be *created* after the earth, but *made*, a word with a totally different meaning.

"It is not the calling into existence of the sun and moon, but the assignment to them of a certain place and orbit respectively, with a light-giving power . . . and why, let me ask of Dr. Réville, as there would plainly be light diffused before there was light concentrated, why may not that light diffused be sufficient for the purposes of vegetation?"

One or two other smaller objections urged by Dr. Réville Mr. Gladstone meets even more convincingly, and passes on to show the remarkable general harmony between the Creation as described in Genesis, and as ascertained by science. No unprejudiced reader can help feeling the force of his argument. For granting to Dr. Réville all that he contends for, (and this merely for the sake of argument) how can we account for the striking resemblance between the Hebrew tradition, and the development hypothesis? Supposing Dr. Réville's objections true, would these disprove a revelation? Would they do more than prove simply a slight corruption of that revelation?

The general process described in Genesis as given by Mr. Gladstone may be summarised as follows:—

1. The point of departure is the formless mass, created by God, out of which the earth was shaped. 2. The detachment and collection of light, apparently from the narrative gradual not instantaneous. 3. The separation of solid from liquid and the beginning of the vegetable kingdom. 4. The heavenly bodies in their final forms, with the process of light-collection

completed. 5. Here the name of Creation comes in again God created the water population, next the air-population. 6. The land-population, *viz.* animals and man. But the transition from animal to man is again marked by the word 'create'

"How came the author of Genesis, he continues, to know that order, to possess knowledge which natural science has only within the present century for the first time dug out of the bowels of the earth? It is surely impossible to avoid the conclusion, first, that either this writer was gifted with faculties passing all human experience, or else his knowledge was divine."

Space prevents our entering on the latter part of the article, which is devoted to an examination, of the manner in which Dr. Réville "undertakes, by way of specimen, to construe the mythology of Homer." In some respects this, though not of such general interest is the finest part of the article, and Mr. Gladstone in a field which he has made his own, submits Dr. Réville's conclusions to a searching and destructive criticism.

Other articles of interest are 'Irish Wrongs and English Remedies' by R. Barry O'Brien, 'Sir Herbert Stewart's Desert March' by Douglas Dawson, 'Disestablishment in Wales by the Right Honorable George Osborne Morgan.

We have heard so much of late of the misfortunes brought on India by the British Rule that it is quite a pleasant change to have the other side of the story told, as is done for one district by Mr. J. Wilson in the *National Review*, in his article "The History of an Indian District." Of course every one who has paid any attention to the subject knows that in spite of many mistakes, and perhaps of much injustice in certain cases, India, as a whole, has gained greatly by British Rule; still a clear history of what has actually been done in this one district is a useful antidote to the pernicious rubbish written by men like Mr. Digby who are gifted with a ready pen but have only a very superficial knowledge of the country, and who probably believe that most of what they write is true. The district chosen by Mr. Wilson is Sirsa in the Panjab. It is part of the alluvial plain lying between the valleys of the Indus and the Ganges; it has a scanty rainfall of only about fourteen inches per annum which falls during two months of the year. The heat in summer is excessive and the underground water can be reached only by wells more than 100 feet deep, and even in these wells it is often brackish. At one time the country seems to have been irrigated and the town of Sirsa was once a fortified place of considerable importance. It was however sacked and laid in ruins by Taimur in 1398 A. D. and though Akbar seems to have done something for it, it never recovered its former importance. Lying as it did on the border of the desert it was the prey of surrounding chiefs and was a scene of constant strifes, and its ruin was completed by the great famine of 1783. In 1803 the district came nominally under British Rule. At that time it was almost a desert :—

"The country to the north was inhabited by sturdy Sikh cultivators, brave enough to defend the produce of their fields against armed marauders; the scanty Hindu population of the dry and sandy country to the south were protected from plunder by the strong arm of the chivalrous Rajputs who ruled them; but this strip of border-land between was the happy hunting-ground of armed bands of Muhammadan robbers, who roamed about from place to place, with their large herds of cattle, and often combined for distant raids in Sikh or Hindu villages, or on weaker bodies of their fellows. There was no regular cultivation, and there were only thirty-five settled villages in the whole of the tract. It was for the most part, an undulating prairie of long grasses, with nothing to break the monotony bnt here and there a group of stunted trees round some natural hollow where the pool formed by the scanty rainfall gave sufficient moisture to support their growth. Along the valley of the Ghaggar there was a dense growth of low shrubs, and on the bank of the Satlej a thick jungle of tamarisk and grasses gave shelter to numerous wild boars and tigers. The seventy miles of prairie between the two valleys was a sort of No-man's land and the Sikhs of the north would often drive their cattle into it for pasture, keeping a sharp look-out against the attacks of the Muhammadan tribes, who had come to consider it their own. The life of these pastoral families was extremely precarious, owing to the want of grain-crops, the uncertain rainfall, and the

scarcity of water. Over a great part of the tract the herdsmen and their cattle were chiefly dependent on the rain-water collected in the natural hollows of the ground, and when one pool dried up they had to move on to another, so that in the hot season the water had to be carefully husbanded, and the cattle allowed to drink only when they could live no longer without it. In seasons of drought, grass failed as well as water; the cattle died in numbers of thirst and starvation, and the herdsmen, whose only support was the milk and flesh of their cattle, and the seeds and berries which grew of themselves in the prairie, were reduced to great straits. Prairie fires were common, and men and cattle were sometimes caught in them and burnt to death. Nor was the desert free from supernatural terrors. Often in the dead of night, the lonely herdsmen would hear, coming from out the darkness, the battle cries of men who had been killed in former border-raids, and, even where there was little danger from human foes, they kept together in large bands for fear of encountering supernatural enemies."

At first the British had their hands too full of more important matters to pay much attention to it but by 1818 the most noted of the robber chiefs, the Nawáb of Ránia had been driven from his stronghold and border-raids had been, in a great measure, repressed. The effect of these measures was soon seen. Bodies of Sikh colonists from the North and of Hindu colonists from the South, whose ancestors had been driven out by the prevailing anarchy pressed back into the prairie, established villages and extended the cultivation. In 1837 steps were taken to further encourage the inhabitants; the village boundaries were demarcated and the tax which had hitherto been collected in kind was converted into a money rate, which though too high at first, was soon arranged on very reasonable terms. The town of Sirsa was rebuilt in the form of a square crossed by broad streets at right angles and was protected by a ditch and rampart. The town rapidly grew in size and importance and has now a population of over 12,000 and the goods annually brought into it for sale average over £80,000 in value.

"The census of 1881 showed that the population of the whole district, which at the beginning of the century had probably been less than 10,000, and had been returned in 1849 as 112,974, in 1885 as 152,182, in 1868 as 210,795, now amounted 253,275, or double the population of Perthshire, which almost equals Sirsa in area. The number of established villages, which in 1800 was only 35, in 1820 had increased to 94, in 1840 to 331, and in 1850 to 431, was now 635, so that of the 650 townships into which the whole area of the district had been divided only fifteen were uninhabited, and whereas at the beginning of the century one might go for seventy miles in a straight line without coming near a settled village, now no part of the district is more than four miles from some village-homestead.

The survey shewed that the area under cultivation, which at the beginning of the century had been practically *nil*, and in 1860 had been 700,000 acres, had increased to 1,050,000 acres, or considerably more than half the total area. An estimate of the average annual produce of the district, founded on a careful observation of several harvests, gave it as nearly 500,000 quarters, and the statistics of trade of the two principal grain-marts, Sirsa and Fazilka, showed that in the average nearly 100,000 quarters of surplus produce are annually exported from the district. The prices of agricultural produce have, on the whole, risen about 50 per cent. During the last thirty years, and the fluctuations of price are very much less than they used to be. This is owing to growth of towns and villages where grain is now stored in large quantities in good seasons to be sold at a profit in bad seasons, and to the improvement of communications, roads having been constructed all over the district, and provision made at suitable intervals for the supply of water to the traders who make use of them. Thus much larger profits are made by the peasants on their surplus produce in good years, and a drought does not cause so sudden and severe a scarcity as it formerly did. During the last three years a railway has been constructed right through the district connecting it on the one side with Delhi and Bombay, and on the other with Lahore and Karachi; and this will certainly have a much greater effect in the same direction."

Another sign of increased prosperity is the rise in the value of land. In 1850 the average selling price was only three pence per acre, in 1870 it was a shilling, in 1876 five shillings and in 1880 ten shillings. Now in spite of the great increase in the land revenue the price is from ten to twelve shillings an acre. The condi-

tion of the people is fast improving in all respects. Poverty is almost unknown and capital is accumulating. Though the district is peculiarly liable to scarcity through failure in the rains there have been no deaths from famine during the last 30 years. Nearly 300 masonry wells, each costing over £100 have been constructed, and the average death rate is only 22 per mile per annum—a very low rate for an Indian district. Serious crimes have become very rare and life and property are as secure as in any country in the world. Here at least the *Pax Britannica* has brought not only security but prosperity too to the inhabitants.

QUERIES.

M. Suryanarayana.

(1) *Professor Huxley says that the order of Creation according to the Bible does not correspond to the order of Creation according to the Evolution theory. If then, Huxley is right, is not the Bible account of Creation wrong?*

Our correspondent refers, we suppose, to Huxley's *Lectures on Evolution*, delivered in New York, in 1876, and republished in a volume entitled *American Addresses*. In the first of these lectures, Huxley compares the Evolution hypothesis of the development of the cosmos with, not the Biblical account of Creation, but with Milton's account of it in *Paradise Lost*. His words are. "I have not spoken of this doctrine as the Biblical doctrine. I do not for one moment venture to say that it can properly be called the Biblical doctrine." In so speaking Huxley, while professing religious indifference, shows at least his good sense. The Miltonic account of Creation is, after all, only Milton's interpretation of the Biblical account. It is his interpretation of it carried out into minute detail, coloured for poetical effect, and arrived at at a time when the Science of Biblical Interpretation was in its infancy. Milton's account must therefore be taken for simply what it is worth, and the Biblical account must not be judged of by it.

But even supposing that the Biblical account of Creation were apparently at variance with the Evolution hypothesis, what then? Two things must be borne in mind in dealing with this question. (1) Science has not yet uttered its last word on the development of the cosmos. It is as yet groping in the dark to a large extent. We know not what facts may yet come to light, nor how such facts may modify conclusions provisionally arrived at. We must wait. (2) The *chronological* is not the only order in which events may be described. That is no doubt the order that Science aims at; but it does not in the least follow that it is the order that will be chosen for other than scientific purposes. There is a *logical* order, as well as a *chronological* order; and an order of importance as well as an order of time; and it may very well be that the purpose the Bible had in view in its account of Creation could be best served by an order not strictly chronological. Our correspondent should endeavour to get rid of the false notion that the Bible, amongst other things, was intended to be a manual of science. As we have already remarked in our answers to queries, the Bible looks at things in their moral and spiritual bearings, and leaves it to Science to find out physical laws.

One point in which the Biblical account of Creation is alleged to be unscientific is the statement that the sun and the other heavenly bodies were not created until after plant life had appeared on the earth. Now we know that plants can live and grow only by means of the sun's light and heat. How then could vegetation have existed before the sun was created? Hugh Miller in his interesting work. *The Testimony of the Rocks*, has propounded a solution of the difficulty to the following effect. The Mosaic account of Creation is contructed from a visual point of view. It describes the process of Creation,

not in the exact order in which it was brought about, but in the order in which it would have appeared to be brought about to an eye-witness of it, stationed on the earth's surface. Miller then goes on to show, from physical and geological considerations, that, for long ages our planet must have been enveloped in a pall of vapour. This vapour was at first so dense as to produce utter darkness. As however the earth gradually cooled down and some portion of the enveloping vapour was liquified, its density became so reduced as to render it pervious to the sun's light and heat. A spectator on the earth's surface, if there had been one, would then have been conscious of the sun's light, but not of the sun himself. During this state of things, plant life appeared, flourished vigorously and culminated in the luxuriant vegetation, the decay of which produced our beds of coal. After a long lapse of time, the enveloping vapour became so rare as to be, not merely translucent but transparent, so that to a person on the surface of the earth, if such a person had been, the sun and the other heavenly bodies would have been visible for the first time. Hence the Bible describing the process of Creation from the visual point of view naturally represents plants as being created before the sun. The force of this solution of the difficulty is, that the Bible in giving an account of Creation follows to some extent a different order from the chronological order.

(2) *Seeing that the duty of every preacher and teacher is to make himself understood by his hearers, what was the motive of Christ in teaching his disciples and the people in parables which they could not understand?*

This qestion suggests the fallacy called by logicians the 'fallacy of accident' *i.e.* the fallacy of arguing from a general and abstract principle to the same principle as applied to concrete cases. Because it is the duty of a teacher to make himself understood, therefore it is his duty never to say anything but what will be understood at once; never to say anything which will cost a serious effort to understand it; never to say anything which will fail altogether to be understood by those who have neglected their opportunities, or blinded their minds by prejudice or weakened them by self-indulgence! The statement of these assumptions is their own refutation. A concrete case will best show the fallacy of these assumptions. Take a class in a college. Does not the professor sometimes say things, and deliberately say them, which are quite unintelligible to even the best students at first? By saying them he excites attention and challenges enquiry; and to minds in such an attitude explanation makes things clear. Again, is it not often the case that what a teacher says, while it is intelligible to those who have been honestly working and keeping pace with the progress of study, is quite unintelligible to those who have failed to do so? But their inability to understand is their own fault, not that of the teacher.

Well apply this to Christ's teaching. He often said things that must have been strange and startling to his hearers, and must have even seemed paradoxical. He did so, for one reason at least, to arouse attention and, as it were, provoke enquiry. And He was ever ready to explain, when enquiry was made. Again, Christ had, in general, a very miscellaneous audience. He had as his hearers, people of all sorts, conditions, characters and at all stages of progress. There were those who were in sympathy with spiritual truth and those who were not. Was He to refrain from saying what those who had some spiritual discernment would understand, because there were others who had none and who would not understand?

Our correspondent specially mentions the Parables of Christ. Much of his recorded teaching was in parables. Why did He to such an extent adopt this mode of teaching? There can be no doubt that his general aim in using parables was to make his meaning more clear and more impressive. Yet Christ does speak as if his parables had, and were meant to have, a concealing power as well as a revealing power. The real fact of the matter seems to be this. The parables of Christ had a power of revealing truth exactly in proportion to the capacity of the hearer. To one who had a receptivity for spiritual truth, the parable was a real help. To one who had none, the parable was

a mere story. The parabolic mode of teaching was thus admirably suited to the circumstances under which Christ taught. There were those amongst his hearers who were at least in sympathy with the truth and were seeking it. Others there were who were opposed to it and that in all degrees ranging from mere indifference and non-committal to bitter prejudice and hatred. Now it might be that, in the case of some of the latter, the parable might win a way for the truth to the conscience, just as its capsule enables the bitter but salutary pill to reach the stomach without offending the palate. Whereas in the case of others whose animosity the literal truth would have exasperated beyond measure, the parable served a good purpose if it concealed the literal truth from their view. In their case the evil results of "casting pearls before swine" were at least avoided. Thus on the whole the parabolic mode of teaching combined the minimum of offence with the maximum of benefit.

(3) *What was the merit in 'Kasee-Khandam', which enabled it to be prescribed as one of the Telugu Text Books for the B. A. Examination of January 1887? Can a Text Book once prescribed by the Syndicate be taken away? If so under what circumstances? What steps have the students to take in order to request the Syndicate to reconsider their selection in Telugu?*

We have made some enquiry about this matter in a competent quarter, and we find that the above mentioned work has the recommendation of being a 'classic,' of being composed in a good style and of not containing a larger proportion of objectionable passages than other similar works. We understand indeed that the portion prescribed is specially free from such objectionable passages. In fact the real reason why it has been prescribed is very much the same as that given to the Laird of Balnamoon. He was driving home from dinner one night in a somewhat hilarious condition, when his hat and wig were blown off. On their being picked up and presented by his servant, he demurred to the wig, saying: "It's no my wig, Harry, lad; its no my wig!" The conclusive rejoinder was. "Ye'd better tak' it sir, for there's nae wale o' wigs on Munrimmon Moor.'. We would advise the students to accept the selection adopted by the Syndicate, lest in going farther they should fare worse.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A HAND-BOOK OF DEDUCTIVE LOGIC.

To the Editor,

Christian College Magazine.

Sir,

I thank you much for the kindness with which you have reviewed my Logic impartially in your last issue of the Magazine; and I trust that, in my interest, you will not grudge me a short space in your invaluable journal for the following lines which I offer in explanation of the criticisms contained therein.

Sir, I cannot, for a moment, think that my 'justification for appearance in print' implies, in the slightest degree, any incompetency in the Professors of Logic in this Presidency. Irrespective of the modes of teaching obtaining in Colleges, I speak of the suitability of the F. A. Candidate's *text-books*, and offer this little volume to him, as containing the portions necessary for him, to be chewed and digested, if *necessary*. Owing to the multifarious nature of the subjects entering into his course, our student finds himself unable to devote as much attention to the subject of Logic alone as is indispensably necessary in the absence of a fully furnished text-book. Hence arise the anomalies that I allude to in the opening sentences of my Preface. I am far from believing that the Professors are either unfit to do justice

to their work, or, being fit, are not inclined to help up the students entrusted to their charge. It may be that they give ample notes on the subject; but how many of our students are there that fully imbibe those lectures which can recur only once in the year? And we cannot but believe that, to the growing mind, reading out of the manuscript notes will not be so impressive as reading out of a *printed* book. May not A, perceiving that C wants something, and knowing also that B is bound and is capable of furnishing him with it, but not in a manner that it is impossible for him to lose it altogether, proceed to supply that want to C in the manner required? Thus, the corollary appears to me to be forced. Again, the passage in question applies with immense force to the numerous private students that go in yearly for the Examination.

Secondly, *paigos* is only a misprint for *paidos*; and *gin* does mean in English "a machine for lifting weights" (vide Webster p. 570). The errors regarding Archbishop, &c., will be found only in ten copies of the book. At the suggestion made by a worthy gentleman, the sentence has been totally recast. As for the last two errors, I acknowledge that they are purely cases of oversight. I could not append a sheet of Errata owing to sheer want of time.

Thirdly, regarding the first of the objections concerning the merits of the book as a hand-book of Logic, if the student cannot gather much from the explanation of the principle of *Reductio ad impossibile* referred to in the Review, let him refer to the explanations of the same, given under each of the succeeding processes, and I am sure he will find what he wants. Next, as to the criticism of the argument against the class-inclusion theory of the import of propositions, I am sorry to observe that I am not fully understood. For, the second sentence in the passage which he quotes, *viz.*, "milk is referred to the class of white things" is what the *theory* advances as the *meaning* of the proposition, "milk is white." I do not mean to say that simple reference of *milk* to the class of *white* things is wrong. What I maintain is, that that is not, however, the *meaning* of the proposition. I think I shall be better understood if I change the last sentence of the same passage to what follows:—

To refer, therefore, milk to the class *white* as if the latter were quite independent of the former, which is clearly to explain the cause by the effect, and *to assert that such a reference is all the meaning of the proposition*, is something preposterous.

As to the last objection, the word *immediately* introduced into the definition in a colloquial sense is explained by means of the phrase which follows, *viz.*, "without the help of third terms." So long as the object of the definition is not frustrated, I think the insertion of the word is not objectionable though it may be a superfluity.

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

A. SUBRAHMANYAM.

[We willingly insert Mr. Subramanyam's reply to our Review of his book, more especially as the only mistake he has succeeded in bringing home to us is our denial that *gin* ever means 'a machine for raising weights.' In this we admit we were wrong. We still think that the terms in which Mr. Subrâhmanyam justified his appearance in print were calculated to suggest, however unintentionally, the idea that the teachers of Logic in our Colleges must be a poor lot. We supposed that *paigos* might be a misprint for *paidos*; but, even so, *paidos* no more means 'boy' than *mine* means "I". Mr. Subramanyam has very substantially modified his objection to the class-inclusion theory of the import of proposition. He now says that to refer the subject to the class denoted by the predicate is not the only meaning of proposition, implying that it is *a* meaning. Well we never contended for anything more than that. Is it not using a rather mild term to call the occurrence in the definition of the name to be defined only a *superfluity*? We rather think anything superfluous in a definition *is* objectionable.—EDITOR *M. C. C. Magazine*.]